

9281. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of citizens of Palco, Kans., submitted by Mrs. W. F. Bomgardner and Mrs. H. Z. Moore and signed by 112 others, favoring the resistance of all efforts at repeal or modification of the eighteenth amendment and against any bill to legalize beer or wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9282. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of E. W. Kostenbader and 100 other residents of Groten, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9283. Also, petition of Mary J. Bowen and 50 other residents of Wallace, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9284. Also, petition of Walter Kinney and 10 other residents of Barton, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9285. Also, petition of James M. Everett and 35 other residents of Lockwood, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9286. Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Groton, N. Y., at its annual meeting, urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9287. Also, petition of J. B. Stewart and 10 other residents of Coopers Plains, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9288. Also, petition of Mrs. Andrew Smith and 30 other residents of Reading Center, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9289. Also, petition of Leroy Abbott and 52 other residents of Painted Post, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9290. Also, petition of Myra M. Seeley and 50 other residents of West Danby, Tompkins County, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9291. Also, petition of Rev. Robert W. Packer and 17 other residents of Trumansburg, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9292. Also, petition of Rev. W. Cleon B. Turner and 48 other residents of Tyrone, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9293. Also, petition of Nellie Kilbury, first vice president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Hornell, N. Y., and 15 other members, urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut

out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9294. Also, petition of Rev. Harold Reed and 105 other residents of Hornell, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9295. Also, petition of Rev. Julian Klock and 23 other residents of Bath, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9296. Also, petition of Rev. Lester J. Trout and 60 other residents of Owego, N. Y., urging the support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9297. Also, petition of Charles Heimroth and 30 other residents of Avoca, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution, to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9298. Also, petition of Mrs. W. T. Gustin and 45 other residents of Elmira Heights, N. Y., urging support of the stop-alien amendment to the United States Constitution to cut out aliens and count only American citizens when making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9299. By Mr. STEWART: Petition of 18 residents of Union County, N. J., urging the passage of House Resolution 97, to amend the Constitution to exclude aliens when future apportionments for congressional districts are made; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9300. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Rochester Mills, Pa., favoring the amending of the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens and count only American citizens when making future congressional apportionments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9301. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Tiffany, Colo., and vicinity, urging legislation to bring about remonetization of silver at a reasonable ratio with gold; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

9302. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of Texas Angora Goat Raisers Association, asking relief for joint-stock land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9303. Also, petition of citizens of San Angelo, Tex., asking relief for homestead owners; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9304. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of citizens of Pittsfield, New Marlboro, Hartsville, Monterey, Great Barrington, and Housatonic, Mass., favoring the adoption of a stop-alien representation amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9305. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William E. Ranft and others, protesting against any Sunday blue law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1932

Rev. Hulbert A. Woolfall, rector of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, of the city of St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has so wonderfully made this Nation and set men in it to see their duty as Thy will, give us, we beseech Thee, the mind of Christ, that all problems, individual and corporate, may be solved in His wisdom and by the power of His spirit. Keep alive in our hearts the adventurous spirit that makes men scorn the way of safety, so

that Thy will may be done. Grant that the heart and will of the world may be brought into harmony with Thine, that faith may capture the minds of those who fear, and that all men everywhere may join in the ancient hymn, "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good will amongst men." Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 27, 1932, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13710) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 7233. An act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 527. Joint resolution extending the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee to Investigate the Operation of the Laws and Regulations Relating to the Relief of Veterans.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BINGHAM presented a resolution adopted by the New Haven (Conn.) section of the Council of Jewish Women, favoring the taking of the initiative by the Government in negotiating with the foreign powers concerned to obtain international action on economic issues, including revision of war debts and reparations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Manchester, Conn., remonstrating against the passage of legislation to legalize the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines, and also against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Hartford, Conn., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from Putnam Hill Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Greenwich, Conn., remonstrating against the recognition of the Soviet Government of Russia in any form, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Ridgely and the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Washington Grove, both in the State of Maryland, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Post, No. 81, Department of Maryland, the American Legion, opposing any reduction or elimination of the benefits now received by World War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of sundry citizens, being members of the faculty of the Tome School, of Port Deposit, Md., praying for the nonpayment of the so-called war debts at this time, and for the appointment of a commission of experts to review the question of intergovernmental debts, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSES (for Mr. DALE):

A bill (S. 5294) to amend the act of May 29, 1930, for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 5295) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Don V. Mears;

A bill (S. 5296) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Travis McDaniel; and

A bill (S. 5297) for the relief of John L. Alcock; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5298) for the relief of John M. Casserly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5299) for the relief of Carlyle Pearson Mixon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 5300) granting a pension to Joseph F. Davison; and

A bill (S. 5301) granting an increase of pension to George W. McElroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 13710) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT TO TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS
APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13520, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page —, line —, insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to subcontractors, labor, and material men who furnished labor and material to the Plains Construction Co., defaulted general contractors for the construction of the post office at Las Vegas, Nev., such sums as he may consider equitable and just to reimburse said subcontractors, labor, and material men for unpaid accounts left by said Plains Construction Co. at the time of its default; said sums to be paid only upon proper proof of actual losses sustained exclusive of profit; and there is hereby made available for this purpose not to exceed \$20,000 from any sum which may remain from the lump-sum appropriations made for building construction purposes notwithstanding the amount of the claims of said subcontractors in addition to the cost of completing the building exceed the limit of cost for the construction of the Las Vegas post office."

REMOVAL OF TROOPS FROM FORT D. A. RUSSELL, TEX.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am aware of the agreement not to transact any business during these particular sessions. However, there is a matter which is very vital to my State and our representation here, and time is an important element in it. If I should wait until next Tuesday, when the Senate reconvenes, the matter will be history and a closed incident. In view of the fact that the Senate has just transacted business by receiving a message from the House of Representatives, I presume that the remarks I expect to submit will not transgress the rule, in that the Senate will not be expected to take any action at this time with reference to my remarks except to permit them to be printed in the Record.

Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Congress to what I regard as the arbitrary, the autocratic, and the unwarranted action of the military branch of the Government in absolute defiance of the civil author-

ities and the Congress. At the last session of the Congress in the so-called economy bill there was incorporated a provision seeking to restrain the movement of troops from various posts in the United States during this particular time in the interest of economy. That language reads as follows:

The President is authorized during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, to restrict the transfer of officers and enlisted men of the military and naval forces from one post or station to another post or station to the greatest extent consistent with the public necessity.

Mr. President, so far as Congress could make it, that was a mandate to the War Department to hold in the then existing status troops and establishments at the various posts and cantonments throughout the United States. Only the most imperative necessity was to authorize the transfer of troops from one post to another. The War Department has already issued an order, which is to be executed on the 1st day of January, abandoning totally what I regard to be a necessary post on the Mexican border, Fort D. A. Russell, in Texas. Let me say to the Senate that this post was established by the War Department back in the days when there was much turmoil and revolution in Mexico. It was first called Camp Marfa, a cavalry post located there because that was one of the most dangerous points on the Mexican border so far as raids and depredations from roving bands and revolutionary and insurrectionary forces were concerned. Marfa is opposite what is known as the Big Bend country. Generally speaking, it is a wild, uninhabited territory for many miles on both sides of the border. It affords natural advantages for raiders and revolutionists and conspirators against the neutrality laws of the United States. The Army established that cavalry post. It has been maintained with varying numbers of troops from that time until the present.

I want to invite the attention of the Congress to the fact that as late as 1927 the War Department came to the Congress and asked for an appropriation to purchase land and to erect buildings with a view to making it a permanent Army post. Later, in 1930, elaborate plans for improvements and increased facilities were drawn and recommended by the commander of the fort. At this point I desire to request that there be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a report of the Secretary of War to the Senate in response to a resolution of inquiry, the report setting forth the facts with reference to the then Fort D. A. Russell, and reasons seeking to justify the proposed abandonment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

1. Fort D. A. Russell, Tex.: The amount of Government-owned land at this post is 434.50 acres, more or less, which was finally acquired by purchase, August 23, 1927. A border-patrol post was established in 1914. The present land was first occupied in 1916, for the protection of the Big Bend country.

The occupation of this post has always been considered a temporary, rather than a permanent measure. The purpose for which the post was established has been served. With the reduction created during the past few years in line organizations, for the expansion of the Air Corps, this post can no longer be efficiently or economically garrisoned. There is no military necessity for the continued occupation of this post and its retention by the War Department is not warranted.

2. Following is the value of all property, etc., situated at the post:

Land	\$25,000
Officers' quarters	97,150
Noncommissioned officers' quarters	49,300
Barracks	193,575
Water system	18,850
Stables	38,425
Mess hall	65,975
Electrical system	13,775
Lavatories	29,725
Sewage disposal plant	16,675
Miscellaneous improvements	201,550
Total	750,000

The total investment made at this post during the past 17 years for the minimum number of temporary, nonstandard structures, as well as utilities, required for the shelter and operation of the garrison, is negligible compared to the amount of funds which

would be required to provide suitable permanent accommodations comparable with those required and maintained at permanent Army posts.

The above valuations are based upon a recent appraisal by local military authorities. In view of the continued downward trend of the economic situation, it is deemed questionable if actual sales would now produce the amounts indicated.

3. The following amounts have heretofore been appropriated by Congress for the purchase and improvement of the post:

Land	\$27,000
Improvements	775,000
Total	802,600

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the report to which I have just referred discloses that as early as 1914 a border patrol was established at that point and that in 1916 the Army took it up as a camp "for the protection of the Big Bend country." In 1927 the Congress appropriated money to purchase it as a permanent camp and to erect buildings. The report discloses that the Government has an investment at that point of between \$750,000 and \$1,000,000 of Government funds. The Government owns more than 400 acres of land upon which the post is situated, and adjacent land has been offered free of cost by the citizens of that territory for any enlargement that may be necessary.

The Government owns a large number of permanent buildings and structures there, a brief reference to which I desire to have incorporated in the RECORD from the pamphlet which I hold in my hand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Permanent buildings	128
Temporary buildings	57
Grand total	185

5. The following number of troops can be accommodated at the post:

Married officers in 1-story buildings which, although of concrete construction, were built at an average cost of \$5,000 each, are small (5 rooms and bath), inadequate, and were not designed for permanent occupancy	17
Bachelor officers in concrete 1-story building, cost \$8,000, inadequate, not designed for permanent use	8
Married officers in small (4 rooms and bath) 1-story frame or adobe building, built at an average cost of \$2,000 each, not designed for permanent use	9
Total	34

Noncommissioned officers in 12 small, 1-story concrete buildings, average cost \$3,000, not designed for permanent use, and two 1-story buildings, frame, acquired with the land	14
Noncommissioned officers in 1-story frame buildings, average cost \$1,988, not designed for permanent use	6
Noncommissioned officers in temporary frame buildings of war-time construction, not suitable for permanent use; 3 of these quarters are on ground which was leased	12
Enlisted men in 1-story concrete buildings, inadequate, and not designed for permanent occupancy	722
Total	754

6. Number of troops now quartered at the post: 27 officers, 554 enlisted men.

Mr. CONNALLY. Recently I protested to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff, General MacArthur, with regard to the abandonment of the post. What do Senators think was the policy announced by the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War with reference to posts of this character? The Chief of Staff, General MacArthur, boldly and bluntly told me that it is no function of the Federal Government to protect the border from the raids of bands and disorderly organizations. He said it is the function of the Army to protect the border only from an organized national force. In other words, if Mexico should send over an army, it would be the duty of our Army to repel it, but that the Federal Government owes the State of Texas and its citizens no duty to protect the border from bands of revolutionists and thieves and cutthroats who might invade the sanctity of our soil.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. Does the Senator from Texas contend that the United States Army is under obligation, in a technical sense, to protect the Texas border from such roving bands as those to which he refers?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean in a strictly technical sense?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I dispute the announced policy as a matter of national policy. That is the purpose for which the post was originally established. It has been the policy of this Government, so far as I know, from the beginning of the Military Establishment to use the Army in protecting the border and its citizens against depredations of roving bands either from Mexico or, in the old days, from the Indian country within its own borders.

Mr. LOGAN. But the proposition to which the Senator is really objecting is the removal of those troops from Texas to Kentucky, is it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I judge by the Senator's interruption that Kentucky is interested in having the removal of the troops to Kentucky?

Mr. LOGAN. Undoubtedly. Does the distinguished Senator from Texas believe that he knows more about what ought to be done with reference to this matter than the War Department?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Senator's suggestion, I hope, is not wholly warranted. I think the Senator from Texas knows as much about what is the duty of the Army to the citizens of the country as does the Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff, if that answers the Senator's question. We are legislating here on the theory that the Army is the servant of the people and of the Congress. The War Department is apparently working on the theory that the country and the Treasury are the servants of the Army.

Mr. LOGAN. The Army is not the servant of the State of Texas alone, is it?

Mr. CONNALLY. The State of Texas is a part of this Union, may I submit to the Senator from Kentucky. It is a part of the Union. It is on the border. It maintains a State constabulary at its own expense and has done its utmost to protect itself. But if the Senator, merely in the hope of having a few troops transferred to his own Commonwealth, seeks to establish the doctrine that the Federal Government owes no duty to other States of the Union exposed to the hazards of attacks of lawless bands from a foreign country, then I can not argue the question with the Senator further.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield further to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield further to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I very gladly yield.

Mr. LOGAN. The State of Kentucky has no need in the world for the troops. They are moved there as a matter of policy, because they can be maintained there at a less cost than they can be maintained in Texas. Is it not true, may I ask the Senator from Texas, that his chief objection is that they are removing the pay roll from this particular section of the country, and not because they are moving the troops away and not protecting the border?

Mr. CONNALLY. Since the pay roll seems to be in the Senator's mind, I suppose that has no effect upon him as to the removal of the troops to the State of Kentucky.

Mr. LOGAN. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon, but it does.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very frank to say to the Senator that I intend to discuss that a little later on, if he will bear with me. I shall reach it in a few moments if I do not consume all the patience of the Senate before I get to that point, I shall say to my gallant friend from Kentucky.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator will recall that formerly Canada and the United States both maintained Army posts along the Canadian border, that a treaty was effected

removing the troops from the border of each country, and since that has been accomplished a period of good will and economy has resulted.

I am interested in knowing to what extent these raids occur, of which the Senator speaks. Of course, if they are numerous and the State authorities are not in a position to handle them, then I think the Federal Government might very well supplement the efforts of the State; but if those raids are in the nature of raids by very small bands, 3 or 4 or 5 men, and the War Department feels it is economical to remove the troops from Texas to Kentucky, I am rather disposed to feel that their position may be well taken. On the other hand, if the troops are really needed to keep law and order along the border in Texas, I would be the last one in the world to want to have them removed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator very frankly that since the troops have been located at that point there have been practically no raids, only a few incursions of lawless bands, and the answer and the reasons, of course, are apparent. The very location of the fortress at that point garrisoned by United States Cavalry has served as a deterrent; it has served as a preventive. When Mexican raiders know that within striking distance there are adequate forces of United States Cavalry they are not coming across the border, and that is one of the reasons why I am insisting that these troops ought to remain there. They will remain somewhere; they will eat just as much in Kentucky as they will in Texas; their uniforms will cost just as much in Kentucky as they will in Texas; and, besides that, they have their quarters in Texas, paid for out of the Public Treasury; and how on earth there can be any economy in transferring troops from the Mexican border, where they are needed, to Kentucky, where they are not needed, according to the Senator from Kentucky, is beyond my humble comprehension. Later Congress will be asked to provide additional funds to build quarters in Kentucky.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have in mind an idea that has occurred to me since listening to the discussion. I am wondering if the Senator has considered the idea that is contained in the question I wish to ask him. Naturally when the War Department moves large portions of the Army from one place to another we wonder why the move is made. Giving them due credit for acting in good faith, the thought has occurred to me that the ultimate destination of the forces being transferred is Washington, D. C.

Recent events have occurred that indicate that in the mind of the War Department a very large army is necessary here, and I am wondering if the transfers now contemplated are not just the first move. Shifting troops from Texas to Kentucky brings them nearer to Washington, and the thought occurred to me that the War Department does not intend to leave them in Kentucky, but ultimately will bring them to the District of Columbia in order to protect the great Capital City against dissatisfied citizens who may congregate here asking that various measures be enacted into law by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator's question provokes me to make a statement about a matter which I had not intended to discuss at any length, and that is this: When I inquired of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff if the Federal Government owed the citizens along the border no protection from foreign raids and if they thought that was purely a function of the State constabulary, and asked them why they wanted to remove these troops, they told me that their policy was to concentrate these troops in a few great posts near the centers of population; and the Secretary of War, with a glitter of fear in his eye, referred to the reds and the possible communists that might be abroad in the land. Then when I challenged his position in that regard and suggested that that was as much a function of the domestic police as was the suppression of raiders along the border—that it was a part of the police power and within the duty of the local authorities of the States—of course he fell back upon the general proposition that they

desired the troops to be stationed close to the great centers of population, where they could train civilian units which come from the heavily populated areas, and that these camps were being established largely for training and maneuvering purposes.

The Senator, however, is on the right trail. The War Department wants a few great camps. It wants those camps near the great cities, near the populous centers, with the thought back in their minds all the time as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, if the Army in time of peace, if the Army, when no war threatens, if the Army, when we are not invaded by an organized force, is to justify its existence, what higher duty can it perform than to occupy stations along the border where there are potential threats to life and to the property of American citizens?

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky, while my State has not been a member of the Union so long as has his, yet, nevertheless, it is a part of the Union. Texas came into the Union of its own free will. It was an independent republic; it had its ministers to foreign courts, and it joined the Union and surrendered its own independent sovereignty because it desired to do so. It did not come into the Union as Kentucky did, perhaps, but it came as a sovereign State into the sisterhood of States, and it is as much a part of this Union as is Kentucky, even though it did come in of its own free will and did not have to be conquered from the Indians by Daniel Boone and other pioneers. Kentucky is a great and marvelous part of this Union, and I bow to the Senator from Kentucky and to the great traditions of that State.

It has been suggested by one of my colleagues that I should make reference to Davy Crockett. Davy Crockett, unfortunately for Kentucky, did not come from that State, but he came from Tennessee.

Texas had a great and glorious future before she came into this Union. Davy Crockett, Travis, Sam Houston, Stephen F. Austin, a great host of illustrious Texans, went out into the wilderness and by their swords carved out their own independence from a great and powerful republic to the south. Texas is a buffer State along the border, and it is because of that fact that I am standing here and pleading for the rights of Texas and of her citizens to have the same protection under the flag, to have the same guaranties that are accorded to the State of Kentucky.

Kentucky is not on the border; she is far from these aggressions; she has no armed bands coming across from a foreign land to lay waste her farms and to rob and to kill her citizens. I can understand in that state of mind how indifferent the Senator from Kentucky is to any appeal except that of the return which the money these troops may spend in his great Commonwealth may yield, but the Army and the national defense are not founded upon the dollar, or at least ought not to be.

This post in Texas is garrisoned by a cavalry organization. A portion of the War Department plan is to do away with horses. They are going to mechanize this unit; they are going to transport them to Kentucky and put them in automobiles in order that they may get to the centers of population quickly and in order that they may speed rapidly back when the danger of domestic insurrection shall have passed. Automobiles in the rough territory along the Mexican border would be totally ineffective; they could never reach the scene of the trouble. Cavalry along that border ought never to be abandoned; and I, for one, drop a tear at the passing of the horse. The United States Army seems to have decreed that that great figure on horseback, the cavalryman, is to go into the limbo of things that were. Instead of the dashing cavalryman chasing Indians or raiders along the border, leading a charge, under the Army's new plan we are to have an 8-cylinder Cadillac, bristling with bayonets and with machine guns, dash down the highway. There will be a new figure of the man on horseback.

Mr. President, I am astounded at the announcement of the policy of the Chief of Staff with regard to the function

of the Army. They have issued an order to move these troops by the 1st of January, in the face of the direction of Congress that, in the interest of economy, troops be not moved. They have ordered trucks to carry these troops to Fort Logan, Ky.

Mr. LOGAN. To Fort Knox.

Mr. CONNALLY. Fort Knox; I beg the Senator's pardon. It ought really to be "Fort Logan," I think; the name ought to be changed, and if I have any influence with the War Department I shall insist, in view of the Senator's gallant defense of a defenseless Army, that the designation of this fortress be changed from Fort Knox to Fort Logan.

Mr. LOGAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if that policy be correct, why does not the War Department move the troops from Arizona? I see the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] here. The War Department is keeping troops in many places in Arizona, but they have reorganized the posts there and they have abandoned some of them. I shall inquire of the Senator from Arizona if I am not correct as to that?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is impossible, Mr. President, to over-emphasize what the Senator from Texas has stated. I do want to say to the Senate that I thoroughly concur in all of his remarks in opposition to the removal of troops from the southern international boundary. Let me advise the Senator from Texas that within the past two years a considerable number of troops have been moved from the Arizona border. Part of them, I may remind the Senator from Nebraska, were transferred to Fort Myer, across the Potomac River from the city of Washington.

Mr. NORRIS. That only indicates that I was right in my surmise.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I may further interrupt the Senator from Texas, let me say that the Army posts along the Mexican border were strategically located.

Mr. CONNALLY. The War Department itself located them with that view.

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly so. It is true that the proposed troop movement in Arizona, against which I have protested to the Senate, from Camp Stephen D. Little and Camp Harry J. Jones was a mere transfer within the State. The troops are to be taken away from the international boundary, where they are needed, to Fort Huachuca, a post at a distance from the border. We believe this transfer seriously menaces the security of two of Arizona's most important cities, Nogales and Douglas, which cities happen to be located immediately upon the international line. The city of Nogales is divided from Mexico merely by a street and the business section of Douglas is within rifle range of Mexico. In each of these cities, within the past two decades, American citizens have been killed and injured with bullets fired from Mexico. It is our belief that the only adequate protection which these two American cities can receive is the actual presence of not a very large number, but of a substantial force, of American soldiers. We believe that the moral effect of the visible presence of soldiers of the Regular Army in uniform in and in the vicinity of those cities is the best insurance they can have from possible danger from across the border.

The Republic of Mexico at the present time is governed by gentlemen who we have good reason to believe are entirely friendly to the United States. But governmental conditions in that country have in the past been subject to sudden change. American troops were first placed upon the border 22 years ago. They have been maintained there, it is said temporarily, for 22 years. The American soldiers have justified their presence every day they have been stationed there. They should not be removed. Let me repeat what the Senator from Texas has so well said, that there is no economy

in the transfer of troops from one post to another at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. Of course there is no economy in the transfer. The plea of economy is a fiction, I will not say of the imagination but of the cold-blooded design of the War Department to do what it wants to do under the shield and under the guise of economy.

To transport these troops from Texas to Camp Knox in Kentucky of course will involve expense. The Congress said it would involve expense when we put in the economy bill this provision, telling the War Department not to transfer troops except in emergent conditions. Yet the War Department, thinking by using the charmed word "economy" to tickle the ears of the people and the administration by saying that this transfer is in the interest of economy, is perpetrating something which is not true and which bears falsity all over it.

Those are bold words, but I expect to maintain them here and maintain them whenever they may be challenged. I have told the War Department what I thought of its plan and scheme. I told them that it was nothing on earth except the edict, the ukase of a cold-blooded, heartless military autocracy that regarded the Treasury and the country as instrumentalities to serve the military autocrats who are controlling the Army of the United States instead of making the Army an instrumentality of service in time of peace to the people and to the Government of the United States; and I desire here and now, in this public way, to repeat that statement.

I do not think the Chief of Staff cares any more about the Public Treasury than he does about the citizens of Texas who are exposed to danger and the destruction of their property from roving bands along the Mexican border. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is eminently correct when he says that the very presence of troops in this area has served as a guaranty of peace. If a criminal or a burglar sees a policeman standing at your front door and knows that he is armed and knows that he knows how to shoot, he is not apt to undertake to burglarize your front porch. If there is no armed protection, if the windows and the doors of your residence are open, if it is advertised to the world that there is no armed protection to your residence, the probability is that the burglar and the sneak thief and the raider and the prowler will invade the premises and exploit your property, and perhaps take your life.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the eminent Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LOGAN. It is a matter of history, I believe, that Texas contributed most manfully to bring about the condition which resulted in the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff holding their present positions. Why does the Senator think they would have any particular animosity toward Texas at this time?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Kentucky, much to my surprise, is undertaking to drag some partisan or political consideration into this matter. I say to the Senator from Kentucky that the junior Senator from Texas had nothing on earth to do with the responsibility of the selection of the present President in 1928, if it is that to which he refers, or to his choice of Secretary of War, or to the Secretary's choice of Chief of Staff. Everything I have done since 1928 has been a public and private protest against what the people of the United States did in the presidential election of 1928; and if the Senator from Kentucky gets any comfort out of that situation I might retort that his own State of Kentucky was carried by Mr. Hoover by, I think, 175,000 votes.

Mr. LOGAN. A little more than that.

Mr. CONNALLY. A little over 175,000 votes, whereas my State went for Mr. Hoover by only about 25,000 votes. If the Senator wants to entangle this matter with the election of 1928, I am wondering if the Senator expects his State to be

rewarded by giving them this camp in the closing days of the Hoover administration because of the large majority by which Mr. Hoover carried Kentucky in 1928.

I pause for the Senator to reply, if he desires.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I do not think so at all. I believe that the present administration was much more gratified by the result in Texas than by the result in Kentucky, because it was not unusual for Kentucky to go Republican sometimes, while nothing like that ever happened before in Texas. So I think the friendship and favors of the administration would go to Texas rather than to Kentucky if they were based upon those grounds.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Kentucky is the only Senator who has suggested that there might be some political angle to this matter. I had no thought of such a thing; but if the Senator wants to base it upon the matter of rewards for political services according to the standard of rewarding the particular State that gave it the largest majority, then, indeed, Kentucky has a more substantial claim than Texas.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas further yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. I want the record kept true. I have made no suggestion that this proposed transfer was on account of political favors one way or the other. I merely suggested that as Texas had contributed manfully to bring about the condition that resulted in the appointment of these gentlemen there is no reason why they should want to punish Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is incorrect. He said that Texas contributed manfully. It did not contribute as substantially as did Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOGAN. Nevertheless, you contributed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, my remarks would not have been so extended except for the very courteous and generous interruptions I have had; but I do not want to close my remarks without registering here and now my solemn protest against this sort of a policy, whether it be in Kentucky or Texas or Arizona. I should abhor this policy if no portion of my State were involved. I know how for years our citizens were terrorized. I know how for years, beginning away back yonder from the time of Madero in 1910, the governors of our State time and time again had to appeal to the Federal Government for protection. I know that protection has been afforded since this fort has been established at that particular point—a point selected by the War Department. I have here the statements of the War Department itself reporting to the Senate that it was placed there for the protection of the Big Bend country. That is the country that I am talking about. Out of that knowledge and out of that experience I hope the Senator from Kentucky will pardon me if, in behalf of my own people and my own State, I entertain the hope that the Federal Government will at least give to my people and my State that degree of protection which it has traditionally been the policy of the War Department to accord, not simply to my State but to every State in the Union.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a feature of this matter that I desire to ask the Senator something about.

I take it that it will be quite expensive to move these troops of cavalry from Fort Russell all the way to Kentucky. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that last year, when the military appropriation bill was up, I sought to do with that bill what had been done with five other bills prior to that time, namely, to cut the appropriation by 10 per cent. I endeavored to have a horizontal cut made on all military appropriations just in the same way that cuts had been made in reference to five other departments. The Senate, however, overwhelmingly voted down any cut in the

military department, and afterwards voted in a provision allowing 10 per cent of the appropriations to be used by the department indiscriminately wherever it desired.

If it had not been for those two votes, the Senator from Texas would not have had the trouble he is having now about the removal of these troops, because the department would not have had the money with which to do it. I am calling the Senator's attention to that matter now, because I expect to make the same kind of a motion in regard to the military appropriation bill when it comes up at this session, and I hope the Senator will vote with me on that matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment, and then I shall yield. The Senator from Tennessee, however, is aware of the clause in Public Act No. 212, to which I adverted a little while ago, restricting the movement of troops by the Army to emergency cases in the interest of economy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I know that.

Mr. CONNALLY. And yet the War Department is absolutely transgressing that instruction, defying the Congress, defying the civil authorities, and doing as it desires.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, while I am familiar with that provision, it is nullified by a provision for which the Senator voted—

Mr. CONNALLY. What provision?

Mr. McKELLAR. Allowing 10 per cent of appropriations to be used in any way that the head of a department desires them to be used; and I have no doubt that it is under that provision of law that these troops are being moved. It ought not to have been enacted. I was opposed to it then and I am opposed to it now. I hope the Senator from Texas will see from actual experience the injustice of the provision, and the next time he will vote with me instead of voting against that proposal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Senator from Texas is in thorough sympathy with the attitude the Senator now expresses with reference to tying up the departments so that they can not transfer funds from one appropriation to another. I do not recall the particular vote to which the Senator adverts; but if the Senator from Texas so voted it was because all of us were under pressure to accept the view that because of the reduction of 10 per cent in all appropriations there should be some tolerance allowed the departments to adjust these savings and economies as between the various branches of the service. If the Senator from Texas voted for that, he voted for it on that consideration, and that consideration alone. I am utterly opposed to allowing the departments lump sums to be allocated where they desire, whether in the War Department or in the Land Office or in the Interior Department or in the Department of Commerce, or in any other department of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say that if the Senator takes that attitude now I feel that my interruption has been worth while, because the Senator did not take that attitude before. By the way, so far as treating all the departments right and being under high pressure is concerned, I beg to say that we cut down by 10 per cent the appropriations in five of the departments, but when we came to the War and Navy Departments we were overwhelmingly beaten by the Senate itself.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LOGAN. I simply want to remind the Senator from Tennessee that I voted with him to make those cuts. Therefore there was no ulterior motive on my part.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not have to remind me of that. I remember it with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Tennessee does not mean to imply that the Senator from Texas did not vote for the 10 per cent cuts on all these appropriations, does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed I do. I have the RECORD before me, and I find that the Senator from Texas voted against the 10 per cent cut on the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. And that is the reward the Senator gets from the War Department!

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the reward; and I hope the Senator will stand with me the next time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not make any pledges, because I do not want to create the impression that I am subject either to retaliation or to any other private reason for influencing appropriations. I am not, and shall not be.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to an excerpt from a letter from the Secretary of War setting forth the considerations governing this proposed transfer, and I commend these to the Senator from Kentucky. He says—I read from a copy of a letter to Mr. GARNER—

The selection of Fort Knox, Ky., as a station for the projected mechanized regiment—

“Mechanized”; that means automobiles—

was influenced by the following considerations: The reservation there is admirably suited both in extent and topographical features for the training and maneuver of a mechanized force.

In other words, there are no trees, no hills, no rough ground up at Camp Knox. This cavalry force can get in their automobiles and charge all around over the ground without hitting any bumps or running into any telephone poles.

Of course, if the troops were down on the border, where the country is rough, where there are bandits, where there are mountains, where there are boulders, these 8-cylinder Cadillacs might run against a boulder, they might spoil some general's clothes—no; there are no generals out in the brush; I beg the Senate's pardon; they might skin some officer's shins if they bumped into some of these boulders. But up at Camp Knox the ground is fitted for the maneuver of automobiles and mechanized equipment. The cavalry troops will charge down four abreast in 8-cylinder automobiles, with machine guns—that is part of the mechanism—and shoot at some targets over a mile or so away, with nothing in the way to obstruct the bullets. There are no obstructions there to the operation of a mechanized force.

Poor old Dobbin. Poor old Dobbin, who eats the farmer's corn, the farmer's hay, and the farmer's oats in these times of agricultural depression. We are to do away with old Dobbin, put him on the junk heap, let the cavalryman disappear and summon forth the chauffeur, with a riding stick, not a sword, but a riding stick in one hand and large, bristling spurs firmly clamped around the steering gear.

The reservation there—

This refers to Camp Knox, and I commend this to the Senator from Kentucky. This is not the portion of Kentucky in which Daniel Boone hunted squirrels and coons and climbed around through the boulders and the rocks and over the mountain sides; this is the part of Kentucky that has been leveled and smoothed out by the War Department for those opéra bouffe training activities.

This change will also augment the troops available in the Fifth Corps Area for the summer training of civilian components.

In other words, they want to take troops away from the border, where they are needed for actual protection, and carry them up to Camp Knox in order to train civilians. To do what? They want to train the civilians for the next war. These military autocrats, like the Chief of Staff, spend their time in peace time dreaming about war, making plans against some foreign power forming designs against the defense of the border; and while the raiders are killing Americans and destroying their property, the general, in his sunny tent or under his electric fan, his spurs up on his desk, dreams about war plans and training the boys of this generation in order that they may be cannon fodder for the next war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator overlooked putting in the category of the enemy the poor, hungry ex-service men.

Mr. CONNALLY. To be sure. General MacArthur was the general in command of that marvelous military exploit to which the Senator refers. This is the same General MacArthur who says that the people of Texas have no right to be protected by the National Government.

However, I want to continue about Camp Knox and the reason why it was selected—

That corps area has training of the character in question on a scale not only equaling but in some particulars somewhat exceeding that obtaining in the Eighth Corps Area—

That is the corps area within which Fort D. A. Russell is situated—

yet has available for the purpose less than one-fifth the number of troops of the latter. Thus, this movement of the First Cavalry will serve, in a measure, to equalize the burdens of summer training in the two corps areas.

They have to have summer training for the poor civilian boys to make them soldiers for to-morrow. That is more important than defending citizens and their property and their lives from foreign aggression or roving bands of cutthroats.

Listen to this. These considerations are insignificant; the considerations they have suggested so far are of little consequence. Listen to the superlative reason which actuates the moving of these troops from Fort D. A. Russell to Fort Knox, Ky.:

Fort Knox is convenient to important centers of the automotive industry of the United States. This is exceedingly important because of the highly specialized motor vehicles which will constitute the equipment of the regiment.

In other words, instead of buying automobiles and sending them out to the camps where the troops are, the theory of this letter is that it is highly important that we move the troops up close to the automobile factory, so that they can buy more automobiles and get them more quickly. I want a portion of this letter from the Secretary of War printed in the RECORD—

This is exceedingly important—

Exceedingly important!—

This is exceedingly important because of the highly specialized motor vehicles which will constitute the equipment of the regiment.

Fort Knox is convenient to important centers of the automotive industry of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the portion of the letter referred to by the Senator from Texas will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The selection of Fort Knox, Ky., as a station for the projected mechanized regiment was influenced by the following considerations. The reservation there is admirably suited both in extent and topographical features for the training and maneuver of a mechanized regiment. This change will also augment the troops available in the Fifth Corps Area for the summer training of civilian components. That corps area has training of the character in question on a scale not only equaling but in some particulars somewhat exceeding that obtaining in the Eighth Corps Area, yet has available for the purpose less than one-fifth the number of troops of the latter. Thus, this movement of the First Cavalry will serve in a measure to equalize the burdens of summer training in the two corps areas. Fort Knox is convenient to important centers of the automotive industry of the United States. This is exceedingly important because of the highly specialized motor vehicles which will constitute the equipment of the regiment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky adverted to the possible complaint against the removal of these troops because of the economic conditions in which that particular community would be left. I will say to the Senator that with me that is a minor consideration. It is a consideration, however, at this particular juncture, when, the Senator knows, even in Kentucky, even in the salubrious climate of his own State, even in Camp Knox, where the roads are smooth and the trees have been removed, and there are no boulders and no rocks and no thorns, economic conditions are distressing, and any disturbance of any economic community at this particular time will bring untold misery and suffering upon the people of that community.

What are the conditions at Marfa? The Army went there in 1916 and established this camp. Marfa was then a small town; it is still a small town. Of course, it is larger now than it was then. The families of the enlisted troops are living out in the town. Many of the soldiers have married women in the community. Many of them have children, have families. Naturally, trade and business have grown up by reason of an Army camp being located there. The War Department, in moving this camp now, when business and commerce conditions are so terrific, will naturally strike almost a death blow to this community and to the business of the people residing there. But that is not to be considered except as a minor factor.

We might consider the situation from the standpoint of the time element. If the War Department thinks it is necessary to move these troops for training purposes in the summer time, it could well wait until the summer to do it, it could well wait until April or May or June to carry the troops to Fort Knox in order that they might conduct summer training. Now, in the dead of winter they are moving these troops and leaving the town and the economic community stranded.

That is not the bitterest chapter, Mr. President; that is not the worst feature of this matter. The War Department is furnishing no means of transporting the families of the enlisted men. They are to be left there in Marfa as public charges upon the Red Cross, or upon the community chest, or upon other agencies in that particular territory. As I have said, many of the men have married and have children. An enlisted man has no way of transporting them out of his meager salary. The War Department refuses to transport them. It refuses to transport them in Army trucks because of the desire for economy. It is economy to move the troops, but it is not economy to also move their families.

It is reported that 200 women and children will be left stranded. But the appeals we are receiving from this particular territory show a most horrible condition with reference to the families and the children of the enlisted men at this post. Of course, the officers' wives and their families will be taken care of, they will be transported, they will get to Camp Knox; but what is to become of the poor, unfortunate members of the families of the enlisted men?

Mr. President, there is pending in the House of Representatives a resolution calling on the War Department and the President to suspend this order for the time being. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has offered a general resolution here not only with respect to this post but with respect to other posts, as I understand it, along the border, asking the War Department and the President to withhold this order for a little while. Has the War Department shown any respect for that situation? None whatever. Instead of deferring to the wishes of the Congress, when it became known that these resolutions were introduced in the Senate and in the House, the War Department speeded up, it hurried up the order, hoping to have it executed, hoping to have it a closed incident, hoping to have it history by the time Congress convenes after the holidays.

Mr. President, that is the spirit of the War Department as conducted at the present time. It is one of utter scorn of and indifference to the Congress. Of course, the officials are polite to Senators on official occasions. If we go to their offices, they are polite. But I want to say on my responsibility that in my opinion the War Department as at present conducted, under the present Chief of Staff, is a cold, heartless, military autocracy; and if it can evade the directions of Congress, it will evade them; if it can, in defiance of the expressed policy of this Government for a hundred years, carry out its own desires, it will abandon this fort, and in the course of time, if it has its way, it will abandon other forts along the border and concentrate the troops now there in a few great centers, where it can carry on its maneuvers, where it can play at war, where there are not the hardships, where there are not the sufferings, where there are not the rigors of frontier service.

Mr. President, they had slated the abandonment of other forts. The War Department had slated the abandonment

of Fort Brown, at Brownsville, which has been a post ever since the days when old Zachary Taylor invaded Mexico at that point. They wanted to abandon that. They wanted to abandon another fort on the border, Fort McIntosh, at Laredo. As I said, they proposed to abandon Fort Brown, but influences reached them and caused the War Department not to carry out the abandonment of Fort Brown and Fort Clark, another fort near Del Rio, at Brackettville, which has been there since the days before the Civil War. They wanted to abandon that, but certain influences reached them, and they reversed their policy. But the fort at Marfa, the most strategic point on the border from Brownsville to San Diego, Calif., is to be abandoned. I say it is the most strategic, because it is at the point of danger. It is at the open door. It is 200 miles from the nearest post to the west and 300 miles from the nearest post to the east. We speak about the open door. The Big Bend country is the open door, when it is undefended, for all sorts of raids and incursions from abroad.

Of course, these bands of marauders are not going to invade El Paso, where there is a big military post. They are going into the open country, where there is no protection, where there are no troops, where there are no peace officers except the constabulary which the State maintains.

Mr. President, what I have said to-day will be futile, no doubt. What I have said will be read in the *RECORD* by the military autocrats who control the War Department. It will be read with a sneer, no doubt, because it is the utterance of a man in civil life rather than a man with officer's bars on his shoulders. It will be read by the Chief of Staff with exclamations of indignation, no doubt with the application, among his associates, of vile epithets applied to the Senator from Texas. But the Senator from Texas is here to represent his State and his people. I shall not be awed by jingling spurs or polished boots. The Senator from Texas will not be deterred from saying what he expects to say on this floor by the fear of future punishment by the Secretary of War or by the Chief of Staff. The Senator from Texas protests against this course as a betrayal of my people to danger, the possible death from lawless bands, in order to gratify the vanity and the military ambition of the Chief of Staff and the War Department.

Those are strong words. I mean them to be strong. From the very depths of my being I resent the attitude of the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War with reference to this post, not simply because it happens to be Marfa, not simply because it is a little isolated post, but because of the policy, which assumes that the War Department and the Army are not the instruments of the civil power to protect our people in time of peace but that they are the instruments of a military machine dreaming of future wars and future campaigns in order to have great training camps. I repudiate it as a betrayal of the historic and traditional policy of this Government. Since its earliest history we have had Army posts along these borders and in the West.

My words will fall on deaf ears. My protests will be disregarded. But I want the *RECORD* to show that no policy of this kind can be enforced and no such doctrine as was enunciated to me in the War Department can go unchallenged so long as the great State which I, in part, have the honor to represent has a voice with which to protest.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, briefly I wish to say that I join most earnestly in the protest against the removal of the troops from Fort D. A. Russell. I desire to express the hope that the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff will yet reconsider their decision to remove the troops.

A few days ago my colleague and I and the able Congressman from the district in which Fort D. A. Russell is situated appealed to the President against the removal of the troops. We entertained strong hopes that we had made out our case, but it seems our efforts were in vain. In view of the fact that legislation is pending both in the Senate and in the House in reference to this subject, I trust that the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff will suspend action until Congress expresses itself.

THE WHEAT SITUATION

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I informed some Senators who are particularly interested in the subject that I would to-day address the Senate on the wheat situation. After further consideration and in view of the understanding under which the Senate is operating I decided not to speak to-day and have given that information to the interested Senators. However, I wish to give notice that as soon as I can obtain recognition after the Senate reconvenes next Tuesday I shall address the Senate on this subject.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an address delivered by John A. Simpson, president of the National Farmers' Union, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network in Washington, D. C., on Saturday, December 24, 1932.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

I come to you at this hour with a heavy heart. Heavy because of the discouraging report I am compelled to make on what Congress is doing.

However, before I go to that, let me tell you about the results of my appeal for membership over National Broadcasting Co.'s network four weeks ago to-day. In that appeal I asked for those who would like to see Farmers' Union in their communities to volunteer in organizing work. Our national headquarters at Kansas, Ill., received offers from 192 persons coming from 38 States. These volunteers are being instructed, and no doubt many of them will be successful in their efforts in getting members for the Farmers' Union. Let me urge those who have responded to continue their efforts in establishing organizations of farmers in their communities. Let me also urge those listening in to-day who were not listening last month to join these volunteers and help us to establish organization, especially in those places where farmers have no organization.

Protection and betterment of any group or class of people always come about through organized efforts of that group or class.

I have just recently been reading the Life of Abraham Lincoln. The author in describing labor conditions of 1832 says:

"Farmers' daughters filled the cotton mills in Lowell, Mass.; they started to work at 5 o'clock in the morning and worked 'til 7 o'clock in the evening, with a half hour off for breakfast and 45 minutes off at noon for dinner; they spent 14 hours a day at the factory and had 10 hours a day left in which to sleep and to refresh themselves and to improve their minds and bodies."

So far as the employers of those farmers' daughters were concerned, they considered 14 hours a day an ideal condition. Such condition would never have changed except as labor organized, made demands, and fought for the concessions they demanded.

I also read from this same book where laborers were often arrested and found guilty on the charge "of conspiring to raise wages." For such offense they were fined and sometimes imprisoned.

You farmers, out there on your farms, selling your corn for 10 cents a bushel, your wheat for 30 cents a bushel or less, and your cotton for 5 cents a pound, I want you to know that the big interests of this country consider that an ideal condition. I want you to know that if such condition is to be bettered, if you are ever to get prices that will mean a decent standard of living for you and your families, it will be when you show the good sense of getting together with your neighbors and organizing in a class-conscious union of your own. You can produce corn for 10 cents a bushel until the day of your death so far as those who make money out of processing and handling your products are concerned. Every day I hear those in high authority say that the farmers of this Nation are evidently satisfied with conditions. They come to this conclusion for the reason that you do not even ask to have the thing made better. Seventy-five per cent of the farmers of this Nation, by their unorganized silence, consent and approve of 5-cent cotton and 25-cent wheat.

Some of you who belong to your organization complain that your public officials take no interest in farmers. Why should they take interest in farmers? Farmers take no interest in themselves. A public official is not going further than those he represents desire him to go. Most Congressmen and Senators are experts in understanding the public sentiment of their districts. These public officials will be for whatever you want when you let them know what you want.

There are about 30,000,000 people on the farms of this Nation who will never know what they want, except just to the extent that they organize. Some of you say that organization is too slow; that reform will come through revolution. No unorganized group can even carry on a successful revolution.

You farmers are the greatest wealth producers of any group in this Nation. Never in the history of the Nation were you permitted to retain the same proportion of the wealth you produce that the other producing groups retain. If you like to think of your children and grandchildren going on for the next 50 years toiling in the heat of summer and the snows of winter to make a few more billionnaires in this country, then refuse to heed this

appeal to organize. If you would like to do your part to change conditions, to change the laws of our Nation in such a way that the laborer on the farm, in the shop, in the factory, and everywhere shall retain to himself and his family the fruits of his toil, then do your part to see that your community is 100 per cent in the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America.

One month ago I begged you to self-organize. I begged you to write to E. E. Kennedy, Kankakee, Ill., for instructions on how you and your neighbors could form Locals of the Farmers' Union. Kankakee, Ill., is the national headquarters, and Mr. Kennedy is our national secretary.

I appeal to you to get this job of organizing done in the next 60 days. Let us be ready to do our part in bringing about the new deal that has been promised after the 4th of March.

I feel that when you and your neighbors become acquainted with the program of the National Farmers' Union, you will accept it 100 per cent.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

All governmental effort in the last year has been a dismal failure. Two things are conclusive proof of this statement. First, when Congress convened a year ago, the army of unemployed numbered about 6,000,000. When they convened this month, the army of unemployed numbered about 12,000,000. Second, when Congress convened a year ago, the index price of farm products was 71 per cent of pre-war. To-day it is 54 per cent of pre-war. These are figures put out by the Department of Agriculture.

A year ago Congress upheld the President in his debt moratorium to the countries of Europe. The moratorium of a year ago was instigated by the international bankers of New York City who were afraid they would not be able to collect what European nations owed them if Uncle Sam insisted on collecting his. Everyone knows now the moratorium was a great mistake. Everyone knows that the moratorium was intended, by the big bankers, to be the first step toward cancelling European debts due this Government.

In the last session of Congress every effort to better conditions was based on the theory that to lend millions and billions to the big bankers, the railroads, and the insurance companies would cure the terrible depression. Children should have known better. The President and Congress in their efforts along this line appropriated nearly \$5,000,000,000 to help big institutions—some of it gifts and some of it loans.

Folks of the radio audience, this is one hour each month when you get some truth. The money-controlled, big daily papers of this Nation will not give it to you. There is not a big newspaper that dares give its readers the truth about what is going on here in Washington. They do not dare tell you or publish the list of big steamship companies that in the last few years have borrowed money from the Government of the United States on 20 years' time and much of it at less than 1 per cent interest. About \$150,000,000 has been lent by this Government to individual steamship companies on the basis I named. The big daily papers of the country lead their readers to believe that the last session of Congress only appropriated \$4,000,000,000 when in fact it appropriated \$9,000,000,000.

The efforts of our National Government not only failed to solve the unemployment problem or the problem of unheard of low prices for farm products, but they also failed in their efforts to save big business. Lending to banks, yet there were over 1,400 that closed their doors in the year 1932. Lending to railroads that are more nearly bankrupt to-day than they were when the Government lent them.

The Secretary of the Treasury testified in December, last year, what would be required in taxes in order to balance the Budget. He came back in March and admitted that his estimates were wrong and asked for a half billion more. The new fiscal year commenced July 1. In a little less than six months the deficit, in spite of the Secretary of the Treasury's figures, is more than \$1,000,000,000. He is still Secretary of the Treasury. It looks as if he would resign.

The present session of Congress has just finished its third week. The House has spent that three weeks in discussing the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and modification of the Volstead Act in the form of a new beer bill. Apparently that is the most important question. Five-cent cotton, 2-cent hogs, and 25-cent wheat get no attention. Thirty million men, women, and children hungry and cold without the means of earning a living receive scant notice. The main subject is beer and booze. Why anyone should worry about beer and booze in Washington is a mystery to me. Anybody can get all they want of it.

In the Senate the subjects considered so far have been the Hawes-Cutting bill, providing for Philippine independence, and another bill providing for the merger of two street-railway companies here in Washington.

The general picture gets darker. Times are harder, more children without food or shelter, thousands of farms being foreclosed every week, yet the United States Senate quarrels and fusses over whether or not they shall pass a bill merging two little street-railway companies here in Washington.

WASHINGTON HAPPENINGS

Everybody is here; the beer crowd; the prohibition crowd, male and female; the millers; the spinners; the meat packers; the money merchants; the beggars, most of them in silk hats; beggars here asking alms for their institutions such as railroads when the beggar himself is drawing more than \$100,000 per year salary. This is true of the insurance companies' beggars, too, and the big bankers' beggars. Also the farmers are here. The hunger marchers came. A small army of ex-service boys have been here.

Of the farmer group about 250 unorganized farmers held a mass meeting in Washington for four days. They came from 26 States. They asked the privilege of addressing the House and Senate. Of course, it was denied them. However, their resolutions were read into the record of both bodies of Congress. There was just one good thing out of these 250 farmers coming to Washington. It was one more proof of the unrest and dissatisfaction of those who live on the farm. I am sure they were real farmers, but the poor fellows do not know that such moves as theirs do not even get consideration here in Washington. Of the 531 Members of the House and Senate there are not 10 who could tell you one thing these 250 unorganized farmers asked for in their petition. I am glad they came. I wish a million unorganized farmers would come to Washington. However, I would much rather a million would join the Farmers' Union.

The organized farmers are here—the Grange, the Farm Bureau, the Farmers' Union and a dozen commodity-marketing organizations. We can at least get a little recognition. We held a 4-day conference, agreed on a program, and for 10 days the Committee on Agriculture of the House has been holding hearings on our proposed marketing bill. It must be we have a bill of some value, because the millers, the spinners, and the packers are here in swarms testifying against what we proposed. After the holidays we will be having hearings before other committees on monetary reform and on refinancing of farm mortgages. We have already taken an active part in the bill for Philippine independence and to a considerable degree have whipped the big sugar interests, because to the bill they wanted to pass we have been able to get amendments that are of great value to the farmers of this country.

We are here on the job. We will be here every day of this session of Congress. We will be here when the next session convenes. You unorganized farmers listening in, why do you stay out of your organization that furnishes you the only means to protect your group and better your condition?

The election, the continued depression, and contact with the folks back home have changed the attitude of many Members of the House and Senate toward the farm organizations. There are a greater number of Congressmen and Senators who are thinking along the lines of the farmers' program who a year ago were not even friendly. We are, at least, making progress. I want you to know that I have no hopes for any remedial legislation in this session of Congress. If we are able to pass any of our proposed farm measures, the President has already announced he would veto them. I do believe that after the 4th of March a special session will be called, in which we shall get some real relief. That is the reason I am so concerned about farmers organizing during the next 60 days. It is up to you farmers to place yourselves in position where there will be no question about what the farmers of the United States want. As long as 75 per cent of you stay out of your own class organization, your enemies can always raise the point that the 75 per cent do not want what the 25 per cent are asking for.

SOME FUNDAMENTALS

During the last 50 years the press, the public schools, and in many instances the pulpit have taught that laws, constitutions, and governments are the most sacred things in all the world. The facts are, laws, constitutions, and governments are always inferior to human rights. The facts are, laws, governments, and constitutions are set up to serve human rights. When they cease to serve and protect human rights, then human rights have a right to trample laws, constitutions, and governments in the dust. This is not a new doctrine. It is not original with me. You will find all of it in the Declaration of Independence.

Probably as many crimes have been committed in the name of law as have been committed against law. Christ was crucified in the name of law. A law can be a bigger thief than any 2-gun man that ever lived. While honest people are working, producing the wealth of the Nation, crooks go to legislative bodies and get laws passed that steal the property those honest, hard-working citizens create.

Here in Washington buildings are marked to be torn down that cost millions of dollars. Buildings that construction engineers say are the very best in Washington. Buildings that the employees who work in them say are comfortable and convenient. Buildings that would be good a thousand years from now are marked to be destroyed with but one excuse given, and that is the outside architecture is not in harmony with the new buildings being constructed.

Any law that permits the destroying of the taxpayers' property like this, in the interest of contractors who are paid for destroying buildings and paid for building new ones, is a stealing law. It is just as much a crime as for some anarchist to destroy those buildings with dynamite.

Just recently the Postmaster General purchased a new car when he had a good one. Some Congressman observed the bill for the new car, demanded to know the purpose of purchasing it. The only reason given was that the Lincoln car the Postmaster General had was not high enough for him to wear his silk hat.

Any law that permits a hired man of the people to waste the taxpayers' money in purchasing another automobile in order that he can wear a high silk hat is a stealing law.

Money merchants with laws that give them control of money, the lifeblood of commerce, deliberately planned to steal every farm home in this Nation and to steal every little business in this Nation, including the small banks. I say to you that all of the crimes ever committed in the history of this Nation do not

equal the crime of the international bankers in so controlling money and credits as to rob the farmers of the Nation of their homes.

If you farmers like it, go your weary way, down the road, broke and homeless. If you do not like it, get into your organization, the Farmers' Union, I promise you, if half the farmers will do that, we can stop these official crimes being committed in the name of law.

REMONETIZATION OF SILVER

In the category of crimes committed in the name of law an outstanding one is the "Crime of 1873." The demonetization of silver is historically known as the "Crime of 1873." Members of the House and Senate, years after it was discovered that a certain law had demonetized silver and put this Nation on a single gold standard, testified that they had voted for the bill not knowing it demonetized silver. It afterwards developed that representatives of the big bankers of England engineered this conspiracy against the people.

In the National Farmers' Union legislative program you will find a demand for the remonetization of silver on the same basis that silver occupied when it was demonetized in 1873.

Remonetization of silver as provided in the Wheeler bill means that silver would receive the same treatment by the Government that gold receives. Anyone possessing gold can take it to the Government and have it coined into gold pieces without expense to the owner, the Government furnishing the alloy and doing the coining. Or, if the owner of the gold prefers, the Government will issue a like number of dollars in gold certificates. If silver were remonetized, anyone owning silver could take it to the Government and have it coined into silver dollars or silver certificates issued by the Government without expense to the owner. There is nothing mysterious about this. It is simply doing for silver what is now being done for gold.

The very people who have brought about conditions that are causing you to lose your home are the ones that keep Congress from remonetizing silver. If silver were remonetized, your homes would be saved. If silver were remonetized, the little bank in your town would survive. If silver were remonetized, it would put the producers in this country on a parity with the producers of practically every other nation of the world. If the United States were to remonetize silver to-morrow, it would be the same thing as doubling, and in many instances trebling, the cost of production in foreign nations. It would mean, when they sold products to us, instead of taking our dollar back with them, they would purchase some of our products to take back with them. To remonetize silver would double and treble the price of all farm products.

The big business men recognize this. In a letter a few months ago to the big business interests of the country a professional reporting agency here in Washington—I have their letter—stated that they had been able to defeat every attempt to expand the currency which would have meant an increase in the price of commodities. This letter is positive proof that those who control the currency of the country do not want a cheaper dollar. They do not want a higher price for cotton, wheat, and corn.

You grain farmers listening in, I want to compare present economic conditions to a grain binder. The bull wheel is the source of all power. It makes the sickle go. It makes the canvases turn and carry the grain to the binder. It makes the packers pack the wheat into the bundle. It makes the knotters tie the knot. It makes the kicker shove the bundle out and off of the machine.

The sickle may stop, and you remedy the thing by removing the stick or whatever may have stopped it. The canvases may clog up, and you unclog them. But when the bull wheel stops, everything stops.

Finance is the bull wheel of the machine that grinds out prosperity for a country. Employment, farm prices, wages, and all other objects are inferior to finance.

If a majority of the House and Senate could get a vision of this question, they would turn their attention at once to the subject of monetary reform. They would remonetize silver. They would take the control of issuing of currency away from bankers of this Nation and restore it to Congress, where it constitutionally belongs. With this done, the bull wheel of prosperity would move instead of sliding; and as other parts of the machinery that obtain their power from the bull wheel needed oiling, cleaning out, or unclogging, it could be attended to.

On this subject I want to quote from Arthur Brisbane in one of his articles published in the Washington Herald December 5, 1932. It is as follows:

"When the Government puts 'I promise to pay' on yellow paper, bearing interest, as it has done on more than twenty billions worth of such paper, that is 'correct finance.' If it wrote and distributed \$5,000,000,000 worth of 'I promise to pay,' on green paper, bearing no interest, that would be dreadful inflation, although the people would save \$200,000,000 a year in interest."

TAXATION

I want all of you to know that there is great danger of Congress passing a manufacturers' general sales tax. The President is asking for it, and the money-controlled daily press of the country are asking for it.

The Farmers' Union, in its national program, says all taxation should be based on ability to pay. The only test of ability to pay is net income at the end of the year.

A manufacturers' general sales tax is not based on ability to pay; therefore we are against it. The manufacturers' general

sales tax is advocated by the rich because they know it makes the poor man bear the burden of taxation.

If you farmers listening in want to have a further burden of taxation put on you, just remain silent, stay out of your organization, and you will have your desire. If you do not want an unfair burden of tax put on you, then write to your Congressmen and Senators at once telling them you want them to work and vote against it.

Besides doing this, write E. E. Kennedy, Kankakee, Ill., and find out how you can become a member of the Farmers' Union, the organization that fights the big tax shirkers.

TARIFF

Our tariff schedules figure about 80 per cent in favor of the manufacturers of our country and 20 per cent in favor of the producers of raw materials.

Take the coal industry, it is confronted with bankruptcy largely because they are at the mercy of large importations from England and Canada.

The lumber industry of this country is on the verge of bankruptcy, competition even coming from as far as Russia. With proper protection thousands of men could be set to work in the forests of this country.

The sugar-beet farmers of this Nation are compelled to compete with the production of the Philippines, where they can hire labor at 10 cents a day. Our dairy interests are smothered with oriental oils that come in free and go into substitutes for butter.

The independent producers of crude oil are almost crushed with the Mellon-Rockefeller importations of cheap oils from Mexico and South America. Again, Russia is also a competitor, and large quantities of crude oil and refined products are coming from that country. In the last session of Congress the independent producers were successful in getting 42 cents a barrel protection on crude oil, but it has been almost nullified by discriminatory ocean-freight rates as between the independents' Gulf ports shipments to the east and the ocean rates on importations from South America.

Farmers everywhere should know and realize that everything beneath the surface of a farm belongs to the farmer just as much as the crops growing on top. The oil and the minerals are yours first. For that reason you should be interested in seeing that your beneath-the-surface crop is properly protected.

MARKETING

The Farmers' Union has for its slogan, "Nothing less than cost of production for that portion of farm crops consumed in this country is a remedy." We are here working for that kind of legislation. Do you want it? If you do, join the organization that is here on the job doing its dead level best to get just that kind of legislation.

We simply want the Government to do for agriculture what it has been doing for railroads for the last 26 years. We want them to take charge of the marketing of farm crops and through licensing the buyers see that the farmers of the Nation get cost of production for the part of their crops needed in this country.

REFINANCING

One of the greatest emergency needs is the refinancing of farm mortgages.

It took just 13 days last December for Congress to pass a bill providing \$2,000,000,000 to refinance banks, railroads, and insurance companies. If they would in the next 13 days appropriate \$2,000,000,000 to refinance mortgages on farms now due and being foreclosed, it would be of much greater general benefit to the Nation.

The Farmers' Union indorses the Frazier bill. The Frazier bill provides for refinancing farm mortgages on the basis of 1½ per cent interest and 1½ per cent payment on the principal each year.

If you farmers listening would like to see the Frazier bill become a law, do the necessary thing, write to E. E. Kennedy, Kankakee, Ill., and find out how you can become a member of this great farm organization.

This week the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which Senator NORBECK is chairman, has started hearings on the Frazier bill, and these hearings will be continued after the holiday recess.

In a number of States judges have publicly announced they will not issue decrees of foreclosure or confirm foreclosure sales so long as farm prices remain where they are.

The judge of the ninth district of Nebraska, who resides at Madison of that State, is one who has made such public declaration.

Several district court judges have made similar announcements. It is just a case of a judge realizing that human rights are superior to property rights.

STATE QUESTIONS

Motor transportation

I want to call your attention to the fact that in 43 different States the State legislatures will soon be in session. Most of them will get under way early in January, and many bills will be introduced that have an important bearing on agriculture. All of these will not be labeled "agricultural bills" either. Let me refer for just a moment to one class of bills that will be introduced in practically every State legislature, and if passed will adversely affect agriculture.

I have had the opportunity in the past few days to see in advance bills that the railroad interests plan to push in each State

for the "control and regulation" of motor-vehicle traffic. I know that these bills are designed to increase the costs of operating your automobiles and your trucks and to impose new costs and restrictions on hired and common-carrier trucks and busses, so that your trucking rates and bus fares would have to go higher. These and similar bills also plan to increase gasoline taxes and to cut into the gasoline-tax funds for all sorts of nonroad purposes.

The intent is to drive freight and passengers away from motor vehicles. We must mobilize our farm forces at the various State capitols and see to it that bills of this kind are not passed through the State legislatures.

Down in Texas a year ago last summer farm folks were not as alert as they should have been, and a law was passed that put 30,000 motor trucks out of business in that State. This law also prohibits farmers or any other private truck owners from hauling more than 3½ tons over routes served by other common carriers, but permits loads of 7 tons where they serve the railroads. These are only a few of the restrictions of this Texas law that robs the farmer of the opportunity of getting lower transportation costs through the use of trucks and busses.

I warn you Farmers' Union members and other farmers to be on the watch for bills in your several State legislatures which provide for diverting gasoline-tax funds for nonroad purposes or that aim to increase the costs of operating motor vehicles or in any way restrict their use.

Lame-duck amendment

Another State question deserving your prompt attention is the Norris-proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This amendment eliminates what is termed lame-duck sessions of Congress. It provides that after the November elections those elected to the House of Representatives, to the Senate, and the President and Vice President elected shall take office in January instead of the 4th of March.

Seventeen State legislatures have already ratified this amendment. When 19 more ratify it, it will be a part of the Constitution. I urge you to do everything possible to get your legislature to ratify this amendment at once.

APPRECIATION AND MERRY CHRISTMAS

I come to the close of my last radio talk for the year 1932.

I want to thank the National Broadcasting Co. for all its courtesies and kindnesses to us.

I want to thank those members of our audience who have responded so splendidly to every appeal made.

I want, also, on this day before Christmas to remind every person listening in that to-morrow we celebrate the birthday of the greatest Teacher that ever lived. He taught and practiced the doctrine of unselfishness. He taught and practiced the doctrine of service. He taught and practiced the doctrine of universal love. He was punished, and He suffered for teaching these principles. May each and every one of us accept these doctrines He taught as the only true guide by which we should live, and may we, in so far as it is humanly possible, practice the precepts of our great Teacher.

I wish you all a merry Christmas and a happy New Year. God bless you, and good luck.

PROCEEDINGS OF UNEMPLOYMENT CONFERENCE

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings of the Washington conference on unemployment held in this city December 2 and 3, 1932.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE ON CONGRESS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The conference in Washington, December 2 and 3, on Congress and unemployment, called by the Joint Committee on Unemployment, was attended by about 160 delegates from 10 States and 18 cities. The speeches and reports are of great interest and importance.

One afternoon about half of the delegates attended a conference with Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to enlist their active support for the program.

Dr. W. Jett Lauck, economist, speaking on Quick Economic Recovery Is Necessary and Practicable, discussing what form of procedure is immediately possible and also may be expected to be fundamentally sound and quickly effective, advocated:

"First. In commercial and industrial activities there must be restraint of competitive forces which will not be against the public interest.

"Second. The term public interest in this connection implies the assurance of a fair return to prudent capital investment; to labor of all kinds, including management, a just and reasonable participation in industrial accomplishment in the form of proper rates of pay and working conditions, security, and regularity of employment; and to consumers fair prices, or, in other words, prices which will cover the costs of production under the foregoing conditions, plus a fair return on capital prudently invested.

"Third. Recognition of the principle that the maintenance of mass purchasing power is essential to the maintenance of the mass production and distribution methods of modern industry, and that this implies (a) constant reduction in the hours of work in order to maintain regularity of employment in the face of increased mechanization and technological improvements, and (b) constant decrease in prices or increases in rates of compensation

to all classes of employees in accordance with lower costs or the increased productive efficiency of industry.

"Fourth. Acceptance of the principle that the maximum degree of accomplishment in trade and industry can only be attained through the sympathetic cooperation of all groups of industrial workers, and that it is essential to the obtaining of such cooperation, and to industrial democracy itself that industrial workers be granted the right to organize and to participate collectively in industry through representatives of their own choosing.

"Fifth. In order to make economic planning and control possible, investment banking should be placed under Federal control and supervision, and proposals for the flotation of securities of industrial and commercial corporations or plans for the reorganization or consolidation of such corporations should be submitted to some properly constituted Federal tribunal for approval.

"As existing policies are ineffective, what practical plan is available by means of which the unemployed may be speedily put back to work, mass purchasing power developed, and economic recovery assured?

"Fundamentally, it is obvious that industry can not and will not resume or expand operations, however much bank credit may be available, unless it is assured that its operations will not result in a loss. This means that industry must have assurance that output can be sold at a price sufficient to cover operating expenses, plus a reasonable return on capital invested. To meet this fundamental requirement stabilization of prices and production under Federal supervision is the only practical method for economic recovery which can now be adopted. The crisis at the present time is so serious that Congress, on convening, should declare that a national emergency exists which necessitates the immediate adoption of such a program.

"The agencies for successfully carrying through such a program should consist of stabilization or price and production control boards with administrative powers to arrange production and price schedules, operating under the advice of an economic council. These agencies would be composed of members representative of all branches of business, finance, and organized labor, assisted by the best experts obtainable. The members could be selected from panels submitted by the different groups. The entire proceeding would be one of industrial self-government under public auspices.

"In putting such a program into effect no person, firm, corporation, or trade association should be permitted to operate without a license from the stabilization board of the industry involved. In order to safeguard and render uniform labor costs and standards and to maintain employment after recovery it would also be necessary to make it a condition of licenses granted to producers.

"(1) That the 30-hour week or the 6-hour day should be mandatory;

"(2) Employees should have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; and

"(3) Rates of pay to all classes of employees should be just and reasonable and must be advanced in accordance with the productive accomplishments of the working forces."

Joseph Schlossberg, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, advocated ending the labor of children and the aged, and unemployment insurance. He said:

"There are three types of such insurance—

"Voluntary insurance furnished by the employers. This is of little value. It can apply only to isolated groups and can be stopped by the employer at will. It can also be made a means of fighting organized labor.

"Joint arrangements between employers and trade-unions, as in the men's clothing industry. That is very helpful. But only a very small proportion of the American workers are organized in trade-unions, so that even if all organized workers were covered by such insurance, about 90 per cent of the working class would still be without such protection. One weakness in such joint arrangements is that the income is at the lowest when the need is greatest.

"In order that unemployment insurance may really afford protection for all wage earners it must be compulsory, nation-wide, and enforced by the law."

Dr. John H. Gray, former president the American Economic Association, discussing how to pay for the unemployment program, said:

"We must have a tax law that meets the major needs of the Government by greatly increasing, by rapid stages, the income and profits taxes in the higher brackets, and by greatly increased estate and inheritance taxes.

"We must abolish tax exemption on Federal securities, and by a change of Constitution (or court ruling) on States and local securities. It is probable that the present Supreme Court would approve a statute taxing not such securities but the income from them; not as a special tax alone on them but as incidental to a general taxing scheme. To all this should be added a tax on the surplus of corporations. Two hundred corporations now control about one-half the industrial life of the Nation and have surpluses far beyond their business needs.

"The talk about balancing the Budget by cutting down the public service or by taxation under present circumstances is economically impossible. Much more is it psychologically and politically impossible. The start must be made by Federal public borrowing and direct relief of unemployment. Nothing else will start production. When production is in full operation there will be no trouble about taxes or balancing the Budget. We borrowed about \$25,000,000,000 for a useless and destructive war, all at relatively low rates, and did not shake the credit, and levied taxes. Had the war continued we should have borrowed

much more and levied much heavier taxes. The taxes were much heavier than we have to-day and the income taxes much more progressive.

"The sales tax, a total failure as a revenue bringer in the limited form in which we now have it, is simply a disguised poll tax and impossible to collect. Teagle's ration-the-job campaign is the same thing under a different name. It is one more attempt to put the whole burden of taxes on the poor. It violates every canon of taxation accepted in the civilized world for 150 years.

"I know of but one reputable economist that has approved it. But as he has been drawing large expert fees as adviser to the Treasury for many years, he is supposed to support every Treasury position."

REPORTS ON FOUR GREAT INDUSTRIAL STATES

Reports were made on unemployment conditions in four great industrial States.

Illinois

Mr. Karl Borders, of Chicago, secretary of the Illinois League for Industrial Democracy:

"The fourth winter of unemployment in Illinois finds the State with the stupendous total of 1,400,000 unemployed. This is over two-fifths of the number normally employed in the State. Over half this number are in Chicago, where fully one-half the number normally working are unemployed. The State Department of Labor reports minute increases in pay roll and employment since the low of July. But the relief load is still steadily climbing as resources are exhausted. Approximately 150,000 families in Chicago alone are on relief, plus more than 20,000 men and women cared for in shelters.

"Practically all of relief funds since February this year have been from State and Federal sources—twenty million Federal and nineteen million State. Continuous relief service has been given throughout this period by dint of vigorous action on the part of the relief commission and organized pressure of the unemployed. Threats of closure of relief stations and one actual 30 per cent cut in rations, have been met with immediate action by unemployed organizations. These organizations have undoubtedly been a large factor in the total situation.

"Although relief standards in Illinois, particularly in Chicago, compare favorably with other States they are invariably below normals set by case-working agencies in so-called normal times. No rents are paid. An average of 313 actual evictions per month have taken place since June, to say nothing of many thousands of removals which cause untold mental suffering.

"There is no cash allowance for incidentals; no provision for school expenses; clothing is inadequately provided. Nonfamily persons are cared for almost exclusively in congregate shelters—an admittedly demoralizing and makeshift proceeding."

Ohio

Dr. I. M. Rubinow, director the Cincinnati B'nai B'rith:

"With the unemployment ratio of over 30 per cent, considering only total unemployment, with a shrinkage in the pay roll from nearly \$2,000,000,000 in 1929 to less than half, or a wage loss of over a billion dollars, Ohio, one of the most important industrial States in the Union, finds itself in well-nigh a desperate position. In a population of some 7,000,000 people, over a hundred thousand families, or a population of between four and five hundred thousand in the State, are being supported out of private and public relief funds. The amount of relief granted, which has shown a tendency to double almost every year since the beginning of the depression, a year ago ran about \$800,000 a month, and now runs at the rate of a million and a half a month. The annual relief budget may approximate \$20,000,000. That represents only a drop in the bucket in comparison with the wage loss sustained.

"Concentrated industrial centers, where one industry predominates, such as Dayton, with its rubber industry; Youngstown, with its steel; Toledo, with automobiles, etc., show an even more distressing situation. Standards of relief have been unmercifully slashed. A grant of \$10 to \$12 a month is beginning to be considered as a normal appropriation. Direct distribution of food, which only two years ago created a sense of horror among social workers, has been adopted almost throughout the State as the only method possible with the means at hand.

"The only ray of hope for a better policy in the future is brought by the report of the Ohio Unemployment Insurance Commission, presented to the governor two weeks ago. The report recommends a well-worked-out plan for unemployment insurance based upon moderate contributions from both employer and employee totaling 3 per cent of the pay roll, out of which benefits of 50 per cent of the wages, but not in excess of \$15 a week, could be paid for 16 weeks of unemployment in any one year after a waiting period of three weeks."

Pennsylvania

Emil Rieve, of Philadelphia, president of the American Federation of Full Fashioned Hosiery Workers:

"Every sixth family in Pennsylvania needs relief as a result of unemployment, according to figures certified by the State Emergency Relief Board to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"The actual situation is probably worse than this figure would indicate, because a number of families in the State are receiving Red Cross flour but no other relief from public funds. This means that thousands of families are right on the border line of starvation, but, as they are only hungry and not literally destitute, do not 'rate' State or local relief.

"The best estimates of the number of totally unemployed in Pennsylvania give us a figure in excess of 1,200,000, which is over 34 per cent of the total working population of the State.

"The emergency relief board of the State has just allocated \$2,000,000 to cover the needs of the unemployed throughout the Commonwealth. Only 5 or 6 of the 67 counties in the State can get along without outside assistance to supplement money raised locally for relief. The \$2,000,000 provided by the State probably affords a relief disbursement of between \$1.50 and \$2 per week to each of the families needing aid.

"Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds paid out by the State are, of course, supplemented by some funds raised by taxation in Pennsylvania itself and in a few cases some local funds are available also. However, the total additional amount provided from State, county, and private funds is probably less than 30 per cent of the amount received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"In the city of Philadelphia the county emergency relief board states this week that 41,000 households are receiving relief. The number of families receiving relief is between 50,000 and 60,000."

New York

Dr. Sidney Goldstein, chairman the New York State Committee on Unemployment:

"In New York State the unemployment situation has grown steadily worse during the last year. Unemployment has increased 25 to 30 per cent in almost every section of the State. In some of the industrial centers 50 to 60 per cent of the working classes are out of work whole time. It is not an overstatement to say that fully 1,500,000 men and women are altogether without work in the State as a whole. This number does not include the men and women who are working part time and losing 2 or 3 or 4 days a week. The pay roll has dropped even faster than employment.

"In the month of October of this year the State emergency relief committee reported 199,000 families under care in the State and 83,000 people waiting for work relief and unplaced. A minimum of 300,000 families in the State of New York are actually in need of aid and it is probable that 350,000 is nearer to the truth.

"The standard of relief in New York City at the present time is down to a mere subsistence level in almost every section.

"If we assume there are only 300,000 families in need and that each family can survive on \$10 a week, New York State will require for the next year an average of \$12,000,000 a month, or \$144,000,000 for the year. This would maintain the families in need on nothing more than a disaster level. But even this amount the State will not be able to provide. The maximum that we can expect the cities to secure is \$30,000,000. The citizens have just approved a bond issue of another \$30,000,000 for the State. This gives a total of \$60,000,000 with which to meet a state-wide need that will require at least \$144,000,000. The State of New York must secure from the Federal Government this year a total of \$84,000,000 if the unemployed in the State are to be saved from further destitution and collapse."

SPEECHES BROADCAST

Through the courtesy of the National Broadcasting Corporation, speeches of Doctor Goldstein, Prof. John Dewey, Dr. John A. Ryan, and Norman Thomas were broadcast on a nation-wide hook-up.

Doctor Goldstein noted the fact that from 20 per cent to 30 per cent more people are out of work in America than when the committee held a similar conference a year earlier. He outlined the program of the committee on relief, public works, construction, and housing, unemployment insurance, limitation of hours of labor, ending work of children and the aged, and taxation.

He charged the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with failure in disbursing the \$300,000,000 available for relief and \$1,500,000,000 for self-liquidating projects, and said:

"This 5-point program, this committee realizes, is but the beginning. What we need most of all in America and in other countries is to restore purchasing power to the great mass of people. Until the people recover their purchasing power they can not buy, and until the people can buy no one can sell and the whole economic machine is slowed down and will come to a dead stop. There is no reason whatever for destitution in this age. We are living in a surplus civilization and possess every element that goes to make up a normal economic life."

Doctor Dewey said:

"Congress in its last session refused to pass the measures for public works and for relief, which the more farsighted and humane legislators introduced. Subsequent experience has confirmed in every respect the predictions then made as to the continuing severity of the crisis and the inadequacy of the means provided for dealing with it. But even that last session made at least a grudging and hedged about recognition of the principle of public responsibility in its provision for possible loans for relief, up to the amount of \$300,000,000. The principle having been recognized, it now remains to see that it is acted upon promptly, effectively, and adequately. We are gathered here to-day to do our part in seeing that our representatives in Congress represent in their action the need of the American people for security, and work, and wherever necessary, for the direct assistance which will preserve their morale from further destruction. We invite the assistance of all others, the radio audience as well as those here gathered.

"The last generation has witnessed the development of a new social responsibility. The idea that there is at least a minimum standard of living which must be maintained has found general acceptance, even though it is not always acted upon. Few persons would now have the hardihood to deny that every normal

individual has a moral right for himself and dependents to live upon a certain plane of decency, security, and opportunity for culture.

"This is a great advance from the older conception that an individual who has broken down had a right to that subsistence which society could furnish by providing poorhouses, asylums, and outdoor relief. It is the difference between being kept alive physically, and having a life to lead which is worth living. It is the difference between a duty of pity and charity which society owes to worn-out individuals, and a duty which society owes to itself to maintain itself as a going concern on a human level.

"Recognition of this new duty has risen out of necessity, not from sentiment.

"Uneasy social conscience feels there is a duty on the part of society to keep the standard up to at least that low level we call the minimum.

"In the civilized countries of the world this duty is organically acknowledged. There are now 18 European nations having unemployment-insurance systems, to which the central governments of those countries make a contribution. I do not admit that this method of relief really meets the need for keeping up the standard of living for all. There will have to be radical changes in our fundamental financial and industrial structure before the responsibility will be fully met. But at least these countries have admitted that there is a social responsibility, and they have done something to recognize it practically.

"The United States, the most industrialized nation of all, the Nation in which both up and down phases of the economic cycle are most extreme, has the proud preeminence of being the only industrialized country in the world which has no systematic social method of meeting the responsibility. Active publicity agencies, duly inspired and greased, have so far scared the American public by repeating, like a parrot, 'dole, dole.'

Doctor Ryan said:

"During the coming winter the number of the unemployed will be at least 12,000,000, which will mean some 25,000,000 persons dependent upon charity for the necessities of life. The average allotment to each would, therefore, be only \$12. Combined with the relief forthcoming from private contributions and local public authorities, \$300,000,000 will not permit the customary miserable allowance of \$4 per family per week.

"Our country has sufficient goods or sufficient facilities for producing them to provide monthly allowances of \$40 to \$50 per family, or \$8 to \$10 per individual. To compel Americans who are destitute through no fault of their own to subsist on less than these amounts is to violate their moral right to a decent living and convict ourselves and our Government of either callous inhumanity or stupid incompetence. If Congress is to perform its elementary obligation toward our helpless millions, it will appropriate \$2,000,000,000 as soon as possible after it assembles next Monday. At the rate of \$10 a person per month this would sustain our 25,000,000 destitute for only 8 months; at the rate of \$8 it would suffice for 10 months. If, through something equivalent to an economic miracle, unemployment should be considerably reduced during the next 10 months, the appropriation need not all be spent.

"In order to put men to work with sufficient rapidity to reduce considerably the amount of unemployment and to bring about a sustained and general improvement in business at least \$6,000,000,000 are necessary. Senator LA FOLLETTE's bill should be promptly enacted. This money should be converted as rapidly as possible into Federal, State, and municipal public works, and the 'self-liquidating' condition should be entirely eliminated. With proper organization the money could be expended fast enough to provide direct employment for two to three million persons within six or eight months and indirect employment for at least twice that number."

Norman Thomas urged that Congress investigate the use of the Army to evict the bonus marchers last summer, and the way in which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has handled funds for relief and self-liquidating projects. He said:

"Affirmative legislation in behalf of the unemployed ought to include recognition by the Federal Government that to-day it is the agency which must take the initiative in providing a maintenance wage for every worker in the United States. That is the first duty of Congress. It can be performed by a declaration of war on poverty and the dedication of our resources to that war. Subsidizing workers as consumers will start more business than subsidizing profit makers. Of course, no one wants such a maintenance wage paid without work any longer than possible. Therefore it also becomes the immediate duty of Congress to enact a program of public works, as many as possible of which shall be remunerative on a very large scale. Here the field of housing furnishes the best possible opening. One-third of our people live in slums and shacks unfit for American citizens, and for the children, who are the builders of the future. Immense numbers of men, directly and indirectly, can be given employment by a \$3,000,000,000 housing program. Experts figure that 85 per cent at least of what might be advanced for such a housing program would be returned through providing rent at cost. The Federal Government should make funds available to municipal and State public housing authorities which provide housing at cost. It might well set up its own housing authority somewhat like the housing board which functioned pretty satisfactorily in the war. It is ridiculous to say that there is no work to be done to give employment to willing workers when we have the unsolved problem of the slums at our door.

"Unfortunately, the Federal Congress can take little direct action in favor of the 5-day week and the 6-hour day. That legislation must depend largely upon State legislatures. Whatever Congress can do to further this principle should be done. Likewise Congress should be ready to supplement the amount of money available in public compulsory unemployment insurance funds which may be set up by States. The conditions under which the Federal Government will supplement these sums should be laid down by Congress.

"The difficulty placed by our Constitution in the way of an effective and well-coordinated drive on unemployment is of itself an argument for the twentieth amendment which socialists have so earnestly proposed. That amendment would give Congress power to take necessary economic and social action for the benefit of workers."

Mr. J. B. Matthews, secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, asserted "relief by work sharing is nothing more than relieving those in the higher income brackets of the responsibility which is clearly theirs in the present crisis. It means wider distribution of starvation." He held:

"One billion dollars of direct Federal relief is the minimum which duty demands. It can and must be raised. No other appropriation begins to match this in importance and urgency.

"Millions of the unemployed will never go back to work on any industrial arrangements we have known in the past. While a transition to new bases of employment is being made, Federal relief of a direct character is the only stop-gap measure that will prevent further collapse and starvation.

"Public works, social insurance, planned production, a shorter work week, and more equitably distributed income are all long-term measures that can not of themselves meet the immediate needs. Direct Federal relief is the only short-term measure equal to a winter that finds unemployment increasing."

Mr. Darwin J. Meserole, president of the National Unemployment League, held that the Government must offer surplus labor employment on public works, and said:

"The Cutting-Huddleston bill provides for a Federal bond issue of \$5,000,000,000 to be expended through the Departments of Agriculture, War, and Treasury. At least \$3,000,000,000 shall be spent by the Department of Agriculture on a system of national highways, afforestation, and in surfacing 47,000 miles of Federal-aid highways situated in every State and which have already been graded and drained. Public buildings, river and harbor improvements, and flood-control projects could also be undertaken by the Departments of War and the Treasury. Roads have the advantage of other forms of public works because of the great need of new highways—our bad roads cost us \$2,000,000,000 a year and the congestion on the roads another \$2,000,000,000—they can be carried on in any volume in all parts of the Nation and terminated at any time without social loss, in this respect differing from such 'self-liquidating' projects as tunnels, bridges, and dams, which must be completed or all amounts expended are wasted. They provide a maximum in the employment of skilled and unskilled labor, in many cases as high as 75 per cent of the money expended going to labor in wages."

Dr. Abraham Epstein, secretary of the American Association for Old-Age Security, said:

"Whereas no economist in the country would say that any family to-day can get along, even on the lowest level of subsistence, on less than \$20 a week, the statements of the governors and other responsible officials replying to the questionnaire of the Joint Committee on Unemployment indicate that the actual amounts of relief given to needy unemployed families are rarely more than \$20 a month. In most instances families of 5, 6, and 7 persons are allowed less than \$5 a week. In many States and cities the allowance per person is actually less than \$1 per week.

"The most important principles in a good unemployment insurance bill are that it be compulsory upon all industries and that the Government contribute a considerable share of the cost of this insurance. Only through such a wide distribution of the risk can the burden of unemployment be distributed upon all elements of society, and especially upon those who can best afford to bear it. This money should be raised by increased taxes on high incomes and inheritances.

"A considerable amount of the present unemployment problem could be immediately relieved by the elimination from employment of the 2,000,000 children now gainfully employed and by the elimination of approximately 1,000,000 persons 65 years of age and over through a pension system. Pensions have already proven the most effective and most economical method of providing for the aged, and the Dill-Connelly bill now before Congress providing for a system of Federal assistance to States having old-age pension plans has already been reported out favorably by the House Committee on Labor."

Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary of the People's Lobby, discussing housing, advocated the reviving of the United States Housing Corporation, but warned:

"Congress must revive the United States Housing Corporation and provide adequate credit for rehousing that very large part of the population of every major industrial city which is now living in insanitary dwellings, as well as foster good homes at low rents in small towns.

"It is obviously, however, not practical to attempt to house unskilled workers on land so high priced that multimillionaires can not afford it for homes.

"A genuinely constructive housing program must plan for the decentralization of industry and of factory workers.

"So long as buildings are taxed at the same rate as land values, land values in congested areas will be too high for good housing within the price low-wage workers can afford, and housing at Government expense of cash or credit is a bonus to slum-owning land speculators.

"Mr. William Stanley Parker, fellow of the American Institute of Architects, as chairman of Mayor Curley's committee making an architectural survey of Boston, recently said:

"Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds constitute a new opportunity to accomplish slum clearance. The local legislation needed will perhaps develop opposition, but that will be the easiest part of the problem to solve.

"The real problem will be to obtain the slum areas at any price that will permit demolition of the existing structures and the construction of new housing of the required low-cost units with a density per acre not exceeding what the surrounding local conditions will determine to be reasonable.

"There's the rub. Until this underlying land-cost problem is solved consideration of the details and costs of the contemplated new housing units is somewhat academic. Concentration on this problem should be, I believe, the first concern of the organized study of slum clearance and low-cost housing here and elsewhere."

RELIGION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Representatives of three great religious bodies, Prof. Jerome Davis, of Yale University, chairman the board of the Religion and Labor Foundation; Rev. R. A. McGowan, assistant director the National Catholic Welfare Council; and Dr. Edward L. Israel, chairman the commission on social justice of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, took part in a notable symposium on Religion and Unemployment.

Professor Davis advocated sending a trade commission to Russia "headed by such a man as Owen D. Young." He said:

"The churches must take more fearless action in meeting the unemployment crisis. Hunger hearings such as those held in Chicago should be conducted wherever the people are not sufficiently aroused to the necessity of Federal aid. Above all else, the church must educate as to the fundamental causes of unemployment and the necessity for removing the conditions which produce the disease. Unemployment is an economic malady, which strikes down millions in its trail and leaves in its wake all sorts of ailments from tuberculosis to chronic pauperism.

"We must recognize that unemployment is not simply a matter of the depression. If we should produce as much as we did in 1929, there would still be 7,000,000 unemployed because of the progress our engineers have been making in displacing men by machines. The fact is we have come to the end of an epoch. We have been living in an era of scarcity. We are now living in an era of plenty. Mankind has not yet awakened to the difference. The present adult population of the United States with the technical skills of our machine civilization could work only four hours a day for four days a week to produce all that we need.

"On the other hand, as we have invented new machinery we have capitalized its values. To-day we owe \$218,000,000,000 on which we must pay interest and dividends. This sum must come from somewhere; either it must be taken from the consumer or from the worker. It seems probable that unemployment insurance is not enough to change the situation. We need a fundamental reorganization of the distribution so that the rank and file of the people are able to make increased purchases. This means profits must be reduced and wages increased. In all probability the 30-hour week will eventually have to come."

Dr. McGowan, while indorsing the immediate program of the committee, said:

"I want the Government to call national industrial congresses for each industry and a general industrial congress of all together to deal with this crisis and to become permanent organs of American life. I want them composed of the trade associations and the unions in each capitalist industry, and of the cooperative-marketing organizations in farming. I want them to be a legislative, judicial, and executive body for American economic life but operating under the direction and stimulation and the curbing and restraining hand of government—of a Federal planning board, the Federal Trade Commission, and the courts. It is essential that the unions should be an organic part of each industry's organization and of all industrial organization.

"The functions of such organization, as I see them, would be:

"To aid in distributing widely the huge potential production of American industry through high wages increased in proportion to production and never dropping below the living wage through lowered prices and through reduced hours.

"To plan and direct industrial stabilization.

"To establish minimum prices.

"To administer social legislation.

"To set up standards of quality.

"To subordinate credit to industrial needs.

"To reform the monetary system.

"I'd like to see all other occupations speedily incorporated in an organized fashion into this organic and functional organization of industries, occupations, and professions. There will indeed have to be regional, State, and city organizations and governmental action to suit the regional, State, and local economic units,

but normally they are subordinate of their nature to the national body.

"An essential task of such joint organization and Government action is to attack the problem of excessive returns for capital and concentration of capital ownership."

Doctor Israel submitted two declarations made by the Central Conference of American Rabbis at its recent meeting:

"There is hardly any economic project, particularly in such a crisis as that through which we are passing, which does not require ethical evaluation. Almost every plan has a far-reaching effect on the welfare of humankind. Business leaders and economists may suggest concrete measures. It is our duty as religious teachers, however, to become essentially specific in our judgment as to the moral aspects of these measures. One of society's chief duties by way of immediate action is the relief of suffering caused by unemployment. This requires a large expenditure of public funds. There have been numerous efforts, both nationally and in States and even cities, to raise such funds by a general consumers' sales tax on vital necessities. Judging this from an ethical point of view, we can not sanction a project which makes the burden the same upon rich and poor alike, and which taxes the impoverished in their purchases of necessities of life in the same amount that it does those who are still comparatively affluent. State income taxes, increased State inheritance taxes, or if ultimately necessary graduated levies on capital, constitute a far more ethical means of meeting the problem of caring for our unemployed. We urge these methods rather than a consumers' sales tax on essential articles of life.

"We call attention to the fact that whereas the pulpit is willing to assist in any and all appeals for the charity of relief this does not sum up our usefulness or our significance in the present crisis. There has been a tendency among those who profit by the status quo to regard, particularly to-day, the pulpit's function to be to raise charity funds to patch up social ills, while keeping silent concerning the wounds which fester underneath the patches. We are ready to assist in all humanitarian charitable projects that may be immediately necessary, but we assert that the more permanent function of religious groups is to evoke a social and economic conscience concerning the administration of our economic life whereby through social and economic reconstruction the periodic pauperizing of masses of human beings through charity and relief will become unnecessary."

SUMMARY OF RELIEF CONDITIONS IN THIRTY-FIVE STATES

(Prepared by the Joint Committee on Unemployment, John Dewey, chairman, Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, chairman executive committee)

Reports from 35 States, including all the industrial States of the Nation, indicated a tremendous need for Federal aid for the unemployed this year.

Certain generalizations from the reports offered.

The unemployment situation in the various States as described in these reports has certain definite common conclusions which indicate that the widespread distress can be met only by the National Government.

As far as the funds made available by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are concerned we find the following situation:

In regard to the funds made available in 12 of the 35 States, no loans have been applied for to-day. In 23 States applications have been made, and with the exception of 1 or 2 States part of the loans applied for have been received. These loans, however, were to apply to the period expiring December 31, 1932. In only a few States was the total amount applied for granted. In many cases the loans made were to individual cities and counties rather than to the entire State. In regard to the amount of unemployment throughout the country this has increased from 20 per cent to 100 per cent during the past year, and in most communities has been doubled or trebled since 1930. The amount of unemployment in the 35 States shows an average increase of 35 per cent to 40 per cent. These figures are for those totally unemployed. No figures were given for those partially employed, but the number was estimated to be as great as those totally unemployed.

In addition to these two groups of people, immediately affected through the loss of jobs by the depression, there are reports of much lower wages for those still employed, due to the competition in the labor market. From North Carolina, for instance, the report brings word that there has been no increase in the number of those unemployed, but that those employed through increased activity in the textile mills are working at such low wages that the destitution is far greater than last year. The amount needed for relief in every State appears to be greatly in excess of the amount which can possibly be raised either by public or private charity.

It is apparent that throughout the country the cities are bankrupt and have exhausted sources open to them through their taxing power. The same thing applies to many States. Estimates as to the amount necessary from the Federal Government to supplement private and public aid state that from one-third to nine-tenths of the total amount necessary must come from the National Treasury. Averaging the estimate given, we find that at least 50 per cent of the aid must come from some source outside of the State. Practically all reports indicate a failure of local drives to attain the goals which had been set for them.

AMOUNT OF RELIEF GIVEN

The total sums which must be raised for relief throughout the country which can not be raised locally are based not upon any adequate American standard of living but on standards far below the levels which have been established by the Government itself and by professional social workers over a long period of years. Relief throughout the country is being given in two forms.

(1) In supplying a limited amount of work for which wages are paid, varying from 75 cents to \$5 per day. There is a limitation as to the number of days' work given to individuals and this varies from one to five days. In most cases, however, it is clear that recipients of made work are not averaging more than \$5 or \$6 a week. In some places they get as much as \$15 a week, but in even more places there will be two days' work a week at \$1 or \$2 a day.

(2) Direct relief in the form of cash or food orders. The average amount given for relief in this form is from \$2 to \$6 per week per family. A few States will maintain a standard of \$10 or \$14 a week. None of the States are giving relief to all who need it, but there is a tendency everywhere to select the hungriest from the hungry.

These figures are for those who are receiving relief and do not take into account at all the vast numbers of men and women who are considered by the statisticians to be employed and who are receiving wages of from \$10 to \$15 a week on which the family is trying to maintain itself. People who are receiving these small salaries are trying to pay for rent, insurance, light, clothing, etc., which means that the amount left over for food is in many cases as low as, or less than, the amount given in relief to those who come in the pauper class.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 3, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we listen to the ageless words of the seer: "So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom." We are grateful to a merciful Providence for having brought us to the threshold of another year. Thy goodness and mercy have crowned our days. We thank Thee, our Father. Oh, happy is he who can go through the thunder of life's battle and keep spotless the garment of his manhood. May we forget the muttering storms, the biting ingratitude, and that day on which the morning opened with splendor but at evening time the sky was overcast. Oh, may we behold the rift in the clouds and mark once more the divine footprints lying fresh before us. To him who hath aspiration shall be given the water of life; to him who hath touched the divine hand shall be given the everlasting arms; to him who hath given an ideal here with hope and love and trust in God shall be given an abundant entrance into the heavenly home. In the name of our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LOANS BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. A few days ago when we were discussing the matter of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I made a statement relative to the proportion of the amount of loans made to small communities that was not absolutely correct. I have had the matter all checked up and have now in my possession a short statement showing the loans and the percentages to various communities, not only in number but also in amount, made as of the close of business December 28. As there is a good deal of interest in that question in Congress at the present time, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in connection with my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Banks and trust companies, November 30, 1932

	Institutions		Authorized	
	Number	Per cent	Amount	Per cent
Under 5,000.....	3,810	70.79	\$157,826,221.68	17.57
5,000 to 9,999.....	440	8.18	49,985,290.95	5.56
10,000 to 24,999.....	410	7.62	78,050,575.30	8.69
25,000 to 49,999.....	198	3.68	60,955,905.58	6.79
50,000 to 99,999.....	165	3.06	107,576,272.10	11.97
100,000 to 199,999.....	111	2.06	80,072,701.09	9.91
200,000 to 499,999.....	52	.97	49,853,505.60	5.55
500,000 to 999,999.....	95	1.76	159,379,384.01	17.74
Over 1,000,000.....	101	1.88	145,751,279.95	16.22
Total.....	5,382	100.00	898,481,136.26	100.00

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13872) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. MONTAGUE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, \$6,568,830: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts appropriated for such purposes shall be available interchangeably in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture for the necessary expenditures for fire protection and other unforeseen exigencies: *Provided further*, That the amount so interchanged shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 per cent of all the amounts so appropriated.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order for the purpose of inquiring if all of these forests would be under one particular department, so that interchangeability would come under the 12 per cent?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The 12 per cent applies to the entire Agricultural Department. Heretofore in the Agricultural Department we have had an interchangeability of only 10 per cent within the bureaus, and I like that a whole lot better than in the whole department. We ought to restore the 10 per cent interchangeability within the bureaus and abrogate the other.

Mr. GOSS. Why does not the gentleman offer an amendment here? Here we are separating these amounts out, and yet the department might easily interchange these appropriations.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I hope before this session is over that this whole question will be properly covered in one bill that will apply to all. This department has never abused that privilege.

Mr. GOSS. Of course it might. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval stores investigations: For the investigation and demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, the weighing, handling, transportation, and the uses of same, \$65,106, of which \$10,000 shall be available for continuing the establishment of a field laboratory for naval stores research work in the pine regions of the South, including erection of buildings.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 53, beginning in line 13, strike out the paragraph ending in line 19.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is a paragraph which authorizes an appropriation of \$65,106 for naval-stores investigation. As I understand it, this bureau was organized more than 50 years ago for the purpose of developing barrel

heads for turpentine that would not leak. That purpose was accomplished many years ago, and the bureau has continued over a period of 40 or 50 years upon the basis of that one job. I went over the hearings on this and they recite the different improvements that have been made in the trade over the last year or so, but they do not recite a single thing which they did themselves. I am advised by those who deal in naval stores, and I can call as a witness our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY], who has dealt in naval stores for many, many years and is thoroughly familiar with that subject, that this bureau is not performing at this time any useful function, and is not accomplishing anything.

I have made many motions during the progress of this bill to cut out or reduce appropriations. The committee has seen fit to turn them down. This time I have more than the hearings, I have the statement of an absolutely well-informed witness. We have passed appropriations here for which there is no justification. This time I beg the House to use its sound common sense for once, and begin to strike out something from this bill. I hope my motion will prevail.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, of course, this study has not been going on on the present scale for 40 years. The House understands that through many of the Southern States the pine trees produce what I might call a juice from which resin and turpentine are extracted. The tree is tapped and containers hung to catch the sap or juice, and that is manufactured into resin and turpentine. The people interested in that business came to Congress for assistance, the Congress established a laboratory down there to work out the problems confronting the whole industry. It is a big industry, and the Bureau of Chemistry, of course, took part in it and made distinct progress in some achievements in its investigation and research. It has improved considerably the price of the pine products, both resin and turpentine, made them more serviceable, taking out the impurities, making the color better, and making the products more marketable. They have perfected stills by which the products can be manufactured more cheaply.

They have done a wonderful piece of work, and the committee believes this appropriation ought to be continued at least one or two more years, until they complete the job.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand the gentleman is most interested in the laboratory, for which only \$10,000 is required. I would be willing to accept an amendment to my amendment which would permit that \$10,000 to remain, if that is the item in which the gentleman is interested, and thereby save \$55,000 which is for the department.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will read to the gentleman what I am interested in:

Permanent type standards for resin, which have been adopted as legal standards for the United States and also for world trade.

Now, the gentleman understands what a standard for resin means. A standard that is properly adhered to, properly interpreted, aids in marketing the product not only in the United States but in the world. When the purchasing public can depend upon a product coming up to a standard which is well known they buy upon that standard. That is the first thing.

They have also improved the stills that are used in the distillation of the turpentine and the manufacture of resin and have improved their operation. This is not a simple procedure. A great deal of the resin contains iron. A process by which to extract that iron is being worked upon, so that it will be pure resin, because iron content in resin ruins it for any purpose.

The gentleman mentioned something about containers for resin. They must be glued, hermetically sealed all around, in order to preserve the turpentine for market. Another thing, if this turpentine is not stored carefully, if it is not put in the proper container and properly sealed, it will not keep. That is one problem they have under investigation and are now working out. In other words, we have entered upon the problem. Whether Congress ought ever to have

done it I do not know, but a great deal of money has been expended in investigation and research work, and it has done a great deal of good for the industry. But we have commenced it, and they are now in the midst of it; and if we discontinue it, all investigations that have been made heretofore, or at least a part of it, are lost. Let us finish the experiment before we stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Chairman, "naval stores," is a name given to the products of the long-leaf pine of the Southland. They consist principally of pitch, tar, resin, and turpentine. There has been no change in the shipment of naval stores for the last 35 or 40 years. However, there has been a slight change in the container. Formerly, shipments of turpentine were made in barrels with a soft wooden head. Heavy wood was substituted in its place, but that change was not brought about by the Government. It was brought about by the paint and varnish trade refusing to accept the barrels on account of great leakage. There is no doubt but what some people are carried on the pay roll of the Government, but this is an actual waste of the people's money. All one has to do is to keep on voting for unnecessary appropriations and heaven only knows what Government functioning will cost. To-day money is taken out of its ordinary and useful channels of business by excessive taxation. Surely the end must come if we are to get back to our ordinary condition in this country.

Mr. GOSS and Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been exhausted.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I move to strike out the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will not prevail. The production of turpentine is a very important industry in my section of the country. Only two nations other than the United States produce commercial quantities of turpentine, namely, France and Mexico. The United States produces more turpentine than any other nation on earth. Georgia produces more turpentine than any State in the Nation, and my section of Georgia, on the coastal plane, produces more turpentine than any other section. In fact the county in which I was reared—Clinch County—and the adjoining counties constitute the greatest turpentine-producing section in the world.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman please point out to the House any actual accomplishment within the last five years by this bureau?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. It is experimenting, as mentioned in the bill, to determine how turpentine can be advantageously processed; how it can be put into salable form; how these products can be made of greatest value to the public; and in that way is helping the value and the price of turpentine.

Mr. TABER. But I understand they are not functioning or accomplishing anything.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. The gentleman is mistaken. I wish to say that an appropriation to help my people get a better price for turpentine is, in one sense of the word, real farm relief. We are begging our farmers not to produce so much cotton and tobacco and to curtail the production of those crops.

The people in my section have several so-called money crops. They can produce turpentine; they can produce cotton; they can produce tobacco, and they can produce watermelons, and so on. If we can help those farmers to take land which is not proper for the cultivation of cotton and tobacco, and produce turpentine, we have gone a long

way toward helping them reduce the acreage of cotton and tobacco. A piece of land in my section of Georgia, if abandoned for cotton and tobacco purposes, in eight or ten years is worth as much or more for the production of turpentine than it was for the production of cotton and tobacco. One of the great problems to-day is how can we work out some system to enable our farmers voluntarily not to put all their land into tobacco or all their land into cotton, but to diversify, and put a part of their land into something else.

This provision which the gentleman from New York seeks to strike out is as follows:

Naval stores investigations: For the investigation and demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, the weighing, handling, transportation, and the uses of same, \$65,106, of which \$10,000 shall be available for continuing the establishment of a field laboratory for naval stores research work in the pine regions of the South, including erection of buildings.

A small section of the South has almost a monopoly on the production of turpentine, and these investigations are very helpful not only to the producers of naval-stores products or turpentine, but likewise to the public generally.

No one is more anxious than I am to cut these appropriations, but we must be fair and retain the items that are of real value to our people. There are few if any items in this bill with so much merit.

If we wish to abolish the Department of Agriculture, that is one thing, but if any agricultural investigations are to be made in the future this item should be retained.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman show us how this appropriation actually helps the people down there?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. It is for experimental work and investigations in these things, which are helpful to the people there.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. That has not been shown, but the gentleman from New York has shown that it does not help.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. This experimentation is not solely in the building of barrels, as was said by the gentleman a few minutes ago. The gentleman from New York looks at it from the standpoint of the purchaser; he looks at it from the standpoint of one who buys this turpentine, these processed naval-stores products ready to be used by the manufacturer. I am looking at it from the standpoint of the man who produces the turpentine.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RANSLEY. I understood the gentleman to make the statement that more money was made by extracting turpentine from pine than could be made by raising cotton on the same ground.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. That is true, especially of the lowland sections of the coastal plane.

Mr. RANSLEY. First, the ground raised cotton; is that right? Then they planted it to pine?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. No; not the same year. It requires several years to make the change on a profitable basis.

Mr. RANSLEY. How old must the pine be before you can tap it?

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Ten or twelve years. It would be better for it to be a little older. What I wished to say when I yielded was that a great many people in my section are to-day ceasing to plant large areas of land in the coastal section with cotton and tobacco, but they are planting it to pine, and that gives them an investment from which in 10 to 12 years the turpentine is worth more than the raising of cotton or tobacco.

Let's carry forward these experiments so that every acre of land taken out of cotton and tobacco and grown in pine timber will be very profitable. This will tend to hold down the production of cotton and tobacco and be helpful to the cotton and tobacco producers of the whole country. Here is

a real chance to help solve the farm problem, by retaining this item which will greatly tend to reduce the future production of cotton and tobacco in this section.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with any real farm-relief marketing program there must be an effective control of both production and marketing. Control these and you can control prices within reasonable limits. The control of production must be by the farmers themselves, must be by proper organization, and must be voluntary. We must help the producer of cotton or tobacco or turpentine produce the greatest possible amount from the least possible acreage at the lowest possible cost of labor and money and then secure a market for this product at the highest possible reasonable price. For all the farmers to cut their cotton or tobacco production in half voluntarily and acting in concert in order to control their marketing and prices would be farm relief. For the reduction to be the result of pests, or bad seasons, or other misfortune would not be farm relief but disaster.

I certainly favor every possible legislative aid to the end that the farmers will soon produce much more cotton, tobacco, and other products, turpentine included, on one-half the land now used, at less cost and market the product for much more than the present selling price. I feel that the appropriation now under discussion is very essential and will enable the department to properly carry on this work which will help the producers of naval stores and other farm products to accomplish these objectives.

Now, let me say just a few words more specifically about the real work which has been and is now being done by this naval stores experimentation. Here is a wonderful field for most valuable research. For instance, synthetic camphor is made from turpentine—turpentine which is shipped from this country to Germany, then manufactured into synthetic camphor, then shipped back to this country to be used in the preparation of celluloid which goes between the plates of glass now being used in automobiles. This is just one illustration of the potentialities of naval stores and turpentine-producing pine timber products, and of the necessity for this research work. This appropriation is fully justified.

I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York is defeated. This activity should, by all means, be supported by the Federal Government.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: Page 53, line 13, after the word "investigations," strike out the balance of lines 13, 14, 15, and 16, down to and including the word "which."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to make available, in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], \$10,000 to continue the establishment of the field laboratory for naval stores. This would strike out the item for investigations and demonstrations of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores.

I am not going to take any more of the time of the committee. This matter has been thoroughly discussed. I think the amendment should prevail.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I may say to my colleagues that I will go as far as anybody in the matter of economy in government, but it happens that to abandon this experimental station or to curtail its operation would not be economy in government.

Our Government has established experimental laboratories for various industries all over the United States. We have spent millions of dollars for research work, and it happens that this laboratory which is located in the district which I represent here is the first one, and the only one, ever established in the United States to carry on experimental work for the long-leaf yellow pine and the naval-stores industry.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. The gentleman is aware of the fact, is he not, that \$10,000 of the appropriation available for laboratories would still be available under my amendment?

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate that, but we do not desire to curtail the operation of this station. We dedicated this station last fall, in October. The Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, the naval-stores representatives, and a large number of operators and others were there to witness the event. I found that the department had very wisely and judiciously expended the \$40,000 appropriated for the establishment of this station. I do not think the best business man in this House could have made as good a showing with the expenditure. They have built permanent buildings, they have installed permanent equipment, and have made an unusually good showing for the expenditure of \$40,000. It appears very much like a \$100,000 investment.

At this station they are teaching the operators improved methods of tapping the trees. Instead of cutting a deep chip in the face of the tree they cut a much thinner chip, thus extending the producing life of the pine tree and enabling the operator to work the tree for 10 years instead of 4 or 5 years. They are finding new uses for turpentine and rosin. For instance, one of the new uses found for rosin was in the manufacture of the nonshatterable glass used in automobile windshields. Synthetic camphor is made from turpentine. This camphor is used in celluloid, which in turn is used in the manufacture of the nonshatterable glass. By using improved methods of tapping they have eliminated waste by preventing the destruction of forest trees by storms. The operators now have abandoned cutting "boxes" in the trees, but instead hang cups with the necessary tins.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. KAHN. Does not the gentleman from Florida believe that these improvements should rest in the hands of the industry and not in the Federal Government?

Mr. GREEN. In California there are a number of Federal experiment stations.

Mrs. KAHN. Millions of dollars have been contributed by two of the California industries—viticulture and wine making.

Mr. GREEN. Our naval-stores producers have done the same thing; they are contributing. We have supported the citrus laboratories in the lady's State; we have supported the pulpwood laboratories in the various States; and we have supported the research work undertaken by our Government, including various kinds of experiment stations and establishments. This naval-stores experiment station at Olustee, Fla., is rendering value received to our naval-stores operators, our pine lumber and timber industry, and to the country in general.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentlewoman from California speaks of industry contributing a share. I think it should be explained that the industry in the South consists pretty largely of the small farmers.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; it does.

Mr. LEAVITT. And they could not possibly develop this industry as an industry could be developed by large lumber companies, for instance, in some parts of the country.

Mr. GREEN. That is very true; and yet individuals there are contributing to this experimental laboratory. For instance, I know two operators in my own county who contributed two large tracts of land to enable the forestry department to carry on these experiments. These tracts of land are within 5 miles of my home. These were valuable timber and naval-stores lands, but the owners were glad to offer them to the Government for experimental purposes. The Hon. R. H. Smith and Hon. Luther G. Powell and their associates cheerfully donated the use of the lands, and very large tracts they are. They have otherwise assisted.

At this experimental laboratory they are studying not only the improvement in production of the gum but in its refinement, distillation, processing, and the equipment therefor. They have found improved methods of distillation which will yield as high as 4 gallons additional spirits of turpentine on one still charge; at even 40 cents per gallon, this is a saving to the operator of \$1.60 per charge. They are finding ways to eliminate waste. They have found ways to make

higher grades of resin; why, they have produced resin of sufficiently superior quality to bring from 1 to 2 cents per pound more on the general market.

They are studying turpentine and resin and related products through fundamental studies of their chemical composition and properties. For instance, resin is used in making common yellow soap, it is also used in making white soap, but now the soap manufacturers of white soap have to test each consignment of resin to determine whether it is suitable for white-soap making. In fact, one barrel of resin may make white soap, without curdling, while the next barrel in the same shipment may curdle. This is one of the many problems now under study at these laboratories. There are any number of related problems they are trying to solve; yes, too numerous to mention in my limited time.

They are encouraging our operators to install improved turpentine stills. In this way waste can be eliminated and labor saved. There are some 1,400 individual turpentine stills in the naval-stores producing belt. This industry gives employment to thousands of our people, and frankly, the operators are fighting with their backs to the wall, many of them have already had to retrench or cease operations altogether. The market for their products is very weak. Thousands of them are losing money daily. Many of them are feeding their employees from their commissaries with no hope of ever receiving payment for goods. They are doing this in a big charitable way and out of the kindness of their hearts. Will you not agree that this industry needs all of the assistance and cooperation that our Government can lend?

So I hope my colleagues will continue this work. We have asked for only a small amount; in fact, the initial appropriation was only \$40,000.

This does not alone affect the naval-stores industry, but also affects the entire yellow-pine industry. There are millions and millions of acres throughout the southern part of our country, producing yellow pine, which are affected by the operations of this station. It is true that our entire country needs to preserve its forests and its forest products. They are even cooperating with our people in reforestation of our lands in connection with this particular station. Our Government owns the Osceola National Forest bordering upon this experiment station and consisting of some 60,000 or 80,000 acres of land. They are working hand in hand, the Forest Service assisting the station and the station cooperating with the Forest Service and officials, and this appropriation will redound in great benefit not only to my district and State but the entire country, including the paint industry, the varnish industry, the medical world, as well as various lines of endeavor using pine wood in building operations and other activities entering into the economic life of our country. I think it would be a decided mistake to discontinue these operations, and I hope the committee, in its wisdom, will continue this work and vote down the amendment and the substitute.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

As a member of the committee, I have heard the testimony in regard to work that is being done by the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils for the turpentine industry. When I visited the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., some years ago, I learned considerable about the practical work this bureau is doing in teaching the farmers who produce this turpentine and resin in the very poor sections of the South, and I am convinced that they are doing a valuable and worth-while work. Three hundred thousand people are dependent on the turpentine industry.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has referred to the manufacture of nonshatter glass that is used now in all automobiles. A synthetic camphor is made from turpentine. The turpentine is shipped to Germany, and there the synthetic camphor is made and shipped back to this country to be used in the preparation of celluloid, which goes between the two plates of glass.

There are many practical problems that are being worked out.

Resin is used in the manufacture of washing soaps and has been used to a very considerable extent. It is now being used in the manufacture of white soap. Some kinds of resin will form a white curd and some will not. It is not known without testing each and every batch of resin whether it can be used or whether it can not be used. This is another problem they are working on and trying to determine in a broad way.

In their distilling processes they have made improvements that enable them to take as much as four additional gallons of turpentine from one batch that runs through the still, and this means about \$1.60 in each case. Then they have also improved the quality of the resin. They showed us samples of resin from a very dark to a very beautifully clear amber. The latter kind of resin brings from 1 cent to 2 cents more a pound or from \$1 to \$2 per barrel more than the old-fashioned resin. The farmer gets the benefit. These are a few of the very practical problems that are being worked out under this appropriation.

Unless we are going to eliminate everything that is to help the poor farmer all over the United States, then certainly we ought not to eliminate this item.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GARBER. Is not one of the main objectives to extract the raw material with a minimum amount of injury to the growing trees?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has referred to that, and that is true and very important. Our pine forests of the South are at stake. Can we not take a national view?

Turpentine and resin are of value and importance to the whole country. They do not concern the South alone.

There is another thing to be considered. As the old long-leaf pine is disappearing, the slash pine is coming along. It produces a different chemically composed turpentine and resin. There are many problems to be worked out in that connection and all of these questions are involved in this appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This bureau did not develop these things. The industry itself developed these large uses for turpentine and all that sort of thing and the bureau is just telling what the industry had accomplished.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. There is one particular item that is referred to where they state they did not perfect the process, they only mention it. However, the department is doing the fundamental research which helps industry to go ahead and improve on the work, just as is done in regard to hundreds and thousands of other industries all over the United States.

The amendments should be defeated.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I shall try not to take the five minutes, but I think the committee would be interested if I did take one or two minutes to indicate how, in connection with this particular appropriation, the Federal Government has gone a very long way into the field of private business.

I wish you would take the time, if you have any interest in the matter at all, to turn to the hearings of the subcommittee, on page 566, and see to what length we have gone in this particular private industry in connection with the activities provided for in this appropriation.

I am reading now from page 566, the testimony of Doctor Skinner, who is in charge of this particular bureau.

Referring to the extract of turpentine and the necessary stills, listen to what Doctor Skinner says:

If a man wants the latest type of still when he is resetting his still, we send that man the blue prints. We do send them to him. But we find this is not enough. Some consulting service has to be rendered, too, for it is generally necessary to supervise the installation of that new still.

Then Mr. BUCHANAN asked:

Why could not that producer come to your plant, if he is so interested, and see how your installation is made there, and then go back to his place and put up his?

Doctor Skinner replied:

Generally that is not possible or satisfactory. We find that the workmen who do the construction work apparently can not follow these instructions—these blue prints—satisfactorily.

I want you to get the full effect of this picture. I repeat that I am not opposed to scientific investigation work, but in this instance we not only investigate but we provide the necessary blue prints for the stills and go still farther and when the man wants to erect such a still, we furnish the blue prints and then send a man to explain such blue prints and do the actual supervising over the erection of the still.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I am not unfriendly to investigation, but I wish to call attention to the unusual length we go in these matters when once we enter upon them.

Mr. GREEN. How about your shipyards and various other things, where the Government furnishes supervision?

Mr. KETCHAM. The comparison of the gentleman is hardly in point, but I do think it is time we begin to see how far the Federal Government responds to requests of a private character and how far the department, anxious to sustain its particular service, can go before the subcommittee in making a showing, saying, "We have demands for this particular kind of service," and urging that the bureau ought not to be circumscribed either in its activities nor as to the amount of money. And so it goes on, and, repeating language used by another, when are we going to be able to bring these things to a conclusion, when are we going to draw the line between private endeavor, private capital, and Federal activities? It seems to me that under the testimony of Doctor Knight and Doctor Skinner that this bureau of the department ought not to go on without end.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words. I want the House to get these facts, so that it may act intelligently. The last amendment offered by the gentleman from New York strikes out all but \$10,000. That \$10,000 says that it is for continuing the establishment of a field laboratory for naval-stores research work, and so forth.

That whole language is brought over from some other bill when that language was necessary. As a matter of fact, there is \$65,000 recommended in this bill. There is \$31,306 for research work, \$37,100 to operate the experiment station.

If this House wants to reduce the appropriation and leave sufficient money to operate the station, they want to leave \$37,100 in the bill. This is a good big station and has just been established. It was opened last year. It is now in operation. You should provide \$31,100 for its operation. If you are not going to do that, strike out the whole item, although I do not advise that course. However, it is up to this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHINDBLOM: Page 53, line 19, after the word "South," strike out the word "including" and insert in lieu thereof "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, all through this bill the committee has been careful to provide that appropriations shall not be expended for the erection of buildings.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now comes on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN) there were—ayes 35, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 52, line 23, to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the amendment to reduce an appropriation?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil-fertility investigations: For soil investigations into causes of infertility; maintenance of productivity; effects of soil composition, cultural methods, fertilizers, and soil amendments on yield and quality of crops; and the properties, composition, formation, and transformation of soil organic matter, \$195,556.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This section deals with soil fertility, and with the matter of the restoration of soils. This is an important subject, and one that demands increasing attention with the passing of the years. The depletion of soils obtains in the valleys as well as in the hilly and mountainous sections of the country.

SOIL FERTILITY

I can not overestimate the value of soil fertility. I have in mind particularly the problem that now confronts the landowners of the Delta of the Mississippi, touching the Sharkey-clay soils, commonly known as buckshot.

There are different types of soil in the lower Mississippi Valley, which comprises some 30,000,000 acres of land. It is the most fertile valley not only in the United States but in the world. It may seem incredible but it is true that there is no experiment station in the entire alluvial valley, with the exception of the boll-weevil laboratories of the Department of Agriculture at Tallulah, La., other than the Delta experiment station at Stoneville, Washington County, Miss., maintained by the State of Mississippi. It may seem anomalous, but it is nevertheless true, that no soil investigations by the Department of Agriculture have been made in the alluvial valley. It is believed that buckshot soils comprise about 50 per cent of the entire area. I am acquainted with these soils, particularly in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. I have had personal experience in the operation of buckshot lands. They are fast becoming so erratic in production as to become unprofitable over a series of years. Unless some adequate soil work is done, a large acreage of buckshot will ultimately be out of cultivation. Heretofore they were regarded as the most productive of alluvial lands. Various methods have been adopted to preserve and restore fertility. Rotation of crops has been practiced. Legumes have been planted. Various experiments have been made at the Delta experiment station, with a view to increasing the fertility of buckshot lands. They have failed to respond to legumes. The Delta planters are stumped by the problem. There is imperative need for a soil chemist.

I understand that the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils cooperates with the State experiment stations. The work is done on a 50-50 basis. I have heretofore on a number of occasions brought to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and to the attention of Dr. Henry G. Knight, Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, and to the attention of Dr. A. G. McCall, Chief of Soil Investigations, the necessity of proper soil investigations, with a view to restoring the fertility of buckshot lands. Inasmuch as buckshot soil obtains in practically all of the States of the lower Mississippi Valley, the problem can not be solved by the experiment station of any one State. There is a national interest.

I shall continue to urge cooperation on the part of the Department of Agriculture with the Stoneville Experiment Station, so that a competent soil chemist may be detailed to give scientific study to this important problem, which will contribute much to the rehabilitation of the cotton growers in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River.

I may say that in addition to the rotation of crops and the planting of various legumes, as well as cover crops, various fertilizer combinations have been tried without success. I commend again to the Department of Agriculture the necessity for careful study and investigation, with a view to restoring the soil fertility of buckshot lands of the lower Mississippi Valley. While Delta lands are fertile, fertility in these lands becomes depleted as in other lands. There is constant need to restore soil fertility.

There has been a good deal of discussion in the consideration of the pending agricultural bill touching experiment stations. In Mississippi there are a number of State experiment stations. The Department of Agriculture cooperates in many ways in fostering the work of these stations. I can testify as to the benefit of the Stoneville Experiment Station, located, as I have stated, in the Mississippi Delta. I know of no institution that is more helpful to the cotton growers of Mississippi. The tests and experiments are of great benefit. The improvement in the types of cotton has vastly increased both the yield and the quality of staple cotton. Sagrain, the new Delta feed crop, is calculated to revolutionize the production of feed stuffs in the Mississippi Delta. It was originated by the Delta experiment station.

It is my thought that all experiment stations should really be under the supervision of the States. The local interests should properly equip and support them. There is need for the work of these stations to be supplemented by the scientific work and research that can only be done by the Department of Agriculture. The Federal Government should not be expected to solve all the problems of agriculture in all of the States. But there are many problems that are national in their scope. The Department of Agriculture, with the larger facilities and with its original researches in science, should aid the States in the solution of the larger problems such as in the matter of restoration and maintenance of buckshot soils.

While I advocate retrenchment and while I favor economy, I believe that in view of the widespread depletion of buckshot soils, I would be warranted in offering an amendment to the section dealing with soil investigations to increase the appropriation to enable the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils to detail a chemist to make a special study and investigation of the problem. There is authority in the chief of the bureau to transfer funds within the bureau to provide for the investigation. In view of the fact that the chief of the bureau has informed me that he feels that he would like to make a transfer of funds that will enable a soil chemist to be assigned to make an investigation of the problem of buckshot lands in connection with the Delta experiment station, I shall not offer the amendment.

In the district that I represent there is a very progressive organization known as the committee for the promotion of Delta agriculture, which fosters the work of the Delta experiment station. The chairman of the committee is Mr. Charles W. Clark, of Clarksdale, Miss., one of the best informed men respecting agricultural problems in the country. Mr. Clark is familiar with agriculture and agricultural conditions not only in the cotton territory of the South and in the United States but in other countries of the world. I know of no man who is more liberally informed on farm and agricultural questions than Mr. Clark. I received a letter from him dated December 2, 1932, in which he points out the relative spheres and activities of the Federal Government in the work of experiment stations. I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and to incorporate therein the letter from Mr. Clark to me, dated as I have stated, December 2, 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

CLARKSDALE, MISS., December 2, 1932.

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITTINGTON: The backwardness of southern agriculture is the outstanding failure recorded against American genius and enterprise. It is a failure of such magnitude as to disturb the commerce and economics of the entire country, and is therefore a national problem.

The road to a brighter horizon is now emerging from the fog of misunderstanding which has so long clouded it. And although a sure path, it is a hard one, so much so that those who clamor for short cuts may falter and grumble when it is pointed out to them. But it is the only path. There is no other. The royal road of dreams has been completely wrecked and rendered impassable by the emergence of indisputable scientific fact, and sorrowfully must we outlaw that road with the sign "Closed forever."

We have a climate the like of which does not exist elsewhere. It is a climate so unique that it offers opportunities of unusual advantage and also of disadvantage. Heretofore we have failed to reap the advantages of it, but have suffered grievously from the disadvantages. The essential facts and the problems that spring from them are set out in an article by me, *The Williamsburg Indictment*, which appeared in the May, 1932, number of the *Country Gentleman*. With this great outstanding fact of climate to deal with, our great problem is to fit an agriculture to it.

This is a whale of an undertaking. It calls for an entirely different spirit and different set-up of agencies to cope with it than now exist. Heretofore we, a transplanted European people, have wasted years of time and millions of dollars trying to establish here the inherited agriculture of Europe.

It never has worked. It never will work. Our climate is far more akin to that of Asia than of Europe, as is proved by the long list of Asiatic plants (rice, sugarcane, cowpeas, soybeans, alfalfa, lespedeza, Persian clover, peaches, cantaloupes, Bermuda grass, etc.) that flourish here.

Rarely have any of these plants, when first introduced, been successful. Selection, breeding, and crossbreeding have been necessary to adapt them. Sagrain, the new Delta feed crop, is an example. It is a cross of two Asiatic plants; and after the selection was made, years of selection was necessary to fix the type. After an adapted type is fixed and becomes productive and dependable, insects must be controlled and methods of harvesting, curing, and storing worked out.

In a recent issue of the *Times-Picayune*, of New Orleans, there is a write-up of the station at McNeill, Miss., which has caused considerable stir. The news is, that by the introduction of three Asiatic plants, the station has been able to graze through the season and fatten for market one steer per acre. Let us assume that in making this claim, Director Greene is within the facts. What of it?

Well, it means ultimately an agricultural revolution. On the nineteen and one-half million acres of Mississippi cut-over land which has been declared fit only for forestry purposes, we have promise of a real livestock industry. But after all, the great majority of Cotton Belt acres are probably as good as the average productive soil of Europe. With abundant rainfall, they are good lands awaiting a suitable agriculture.

In the results at McNeill, we have an interesting example of what effort and persistence will do. The scientific men had tried Bermuda grass, and found that it was good only until hot weather, after which it was neither palatable nor nourishing. Accordingly they sought a new grass—and found it. A clover from Persia was also found to be adapted to these lands. It grew with the grass and furnished nitrogen for it—an excellent combination. A new form of lespedeza from Korea was also fitted in, so that, instead of pastures unproductive throughout the summer and fall, they now have dependable grazing from February until December, something that few sections can boast. But the problems of insects and internal parasites are yet unsolved, and much work yet remains to be done before that section can come to the front. And, of course, the money is not available to finish the work. It never is!

So far, we have been discussing southern farming from the commercial side, but there is another side fully as important, if not more so, than the commercial side—the production of food.

Public opinion is wedded to the belief that when it comes to food production the lower South is an Eldorado. Nothing could be further from the truth. The little burst of spring vegetables from the South in northern markets is very misleading. The fact is, that conventional summer food crops are not generally successful, and even the "fall garden" is an uncertain gamble. The per acre production of such crops as peas, beans, tomatoes, Irish potatoes, etc., is small compared to other sections, and the failure of southern canning factories proves it. As for growing livestock, I know of no reputable southern agriculturist who, until the local success at McNeill, believed that it could be profitably done with the grasses and grains that have so far found a place here. True, Texas has a livestock industry, but on Texas grazing lands it requires a large acreage to sustain a cow, and only the immensity of the area available and the cheapness of the land make the industry practicable. On the Edwards Plateau, for example, it requires a minimum of 4 square miles to support a family.

So the old slogan so often shouted at us, "Live at home," "Grow your food and feed" are based on ignorance. True, the

South, under stress of this depression, has an immense acreage in food and feed crops—greater, in fact, than in cotton—but with our poor yields this sort of farming is anything but profitable. In 1931 Mississippi, with nearly 3,000,000 acres in corn, did not produce enough for her own use. Yet if better varieties were bred up or introduced, we could have an entirely different picture.

Who is to blame for this tragic failure of southern agriculture? Unquestionably the Nation.

When the Williamsburg convention of 1679 fastened its indictment upon the South, it established a tradition which to-day is as firmly established and as blighting as ever it was. On the platform and in the press throughout the country this ancient superstition of southern sloth has been incessantly preached. Speaking of the law passed in Virginia in 1679, to compel farmers to grow corn, Frederick Law Olmstead, in his *Travels in the Seaboard Slave States* (1854), had this to say:

"I am told, and the southern agricultural journals confirm it, that such laws are needed now in some parts of the cotton States, and would be advocated but for the shame of publishing to the North the irreformable improvidence of the people."

In the 1914 Year Book of the Department of Agriculture, page 19, Secretary Houston repeated the indictment, and just before leaving office Secretary Jardine scathingly indicted the southern farmer. Coming from the agricultural heads of the country, this sort of blindness is simply devastating. Even the southern banker and business man believe that our farmers are laggards, and so fixed is this idea that it is next to impossible to secure adequate appropriations for our experiment stations.

Under existing conditions it is small wonder that our Delta committee, after years of labor, have made but little headway. Our Mississippi legislator, to all our pleas, only too often dismisses us with the Williamsburg indictment, "Grow your food and feed." And how can we make him see that this parrot talk merely states the problem?

Now the notion is widely current that the Department of Agriculture stands ready on call to go to any State and solve any agricultural problem that may arise. This is sheer nonsense. It is the duty of the States properly to equip and staff their own stations for practical research in agriculture. To the department at Washington should be left original work in pure science, and obscure problems arising in the States should be submitted to its highly trained experts, just as the country physicians call on the specialists when a problem is too much for them.

There is no other way that the thing can function properly. Treating the department as a sort of emergency station for hurry calls has greatly injured it. This was well enough in pioneer days, when agricultural science was in its infancy, but to-day it is an anachronism. Our Southern States at least have sufficient resources to have proper experiment stations, but none have. Yet we find southern farmers, when unable to get satisfaction from their State stations, bringing pressure to bear on the Department of Agriculture to send its own men to the State stations to work on local problems.

No. It is going to take some sort of cataclysm to bring about betterment. The process of educating the public to the necessity of financing southern research work is entirely too slow, and some more effective way must be found. If this terrible badge of poverty is to be removed from the South, there must be something more than local evangelical work.

But suppose the President sounded the call.

Suppose that in his inaugural address he said that so far from the southern farmer being a sluggard, he is, in fact, faced with some of the most complex and elusive problems that ever faced an agricultural people in the history of the world. And suppose he said further that it would be a prime object of his administration to see that if the Southern States should properly equip, staff, and support their experiment stations, the Department of Agriculture would do its part.

Do you doubt but that the South would rise to the call? Do you believe that the abominable Williamsburg indictment could survive an attack from such a source?

The South holds the President elect in high esteem. Not only has he had farm experience, but he owns lands in the South. And this section feels that his interest in it is something more than perfunctory. With his backing, this long-delayed work would quickly get under way, and the problems which have kept the South poor and backward will be solved.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. W. CLARK.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a very important amendment here, and I ask unanimous consent to return to page 52, line 23, to offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members present. A quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, \$1,670,194, of which amount not to exceed \$1,095,895 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$650 shall

be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: Page 54, line 25, after the word "exceed," strike out "\$1,095,695" and insert "\$750,000."

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not decrease the appropriation. I would reduce it if I could, but it seems there are those still in Congress who do not realize that a panic is on in this country. My amendment transfers this money back to the States for expenditures in the States instead of spending it here in the District of Columbia. If this information is so important that the farmers ought to have it, they ought to have it first hand. It ought to be carried to them by men who are trained by these experts, by these scientists, for whom we are appropriating these millions of dollars. They ought to go into the States and carry it to the farmers direct. That is what I am asking for by this amendment. We are going to spend \$1,095,695 of this appropriation here in the District of Columbia, and I hold that that is too much to spend in the District of Columbia when the farmers are in the condition they are. If we are going to help them, let us help them first-hand and give them first-hand aid. They need it. They do not need this money spent in the District of Columbia. They need it spent down there face to face with them, right there on the farms, where they can solve their economic conditions.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What provision would there be in this bill for expending the money among the farmers if it is not spent here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ALLGOOD. Oh, there is permission for the different stations, the different tests, and all these chemical laboratories, but they are spending all the money here in the District of Columbia instead of spending it in the 48 States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am wondering if it would not be necessary to amend the bill to increase the amounts that may be spent in the territory outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLGOOD. If a perfecting amendment is needed, I will be willing to accept that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman wishes to accomplish that desired end, I think it would be necessary.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman from Alabama ought to be complimented for trying to help agriculture and get the money away from the bureaucrats.

Mr. ALLGOOD. That is what I am trying to do; and if it requires a perfecting amendment, I will be glad to have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] help frame the perfecting amendment. If this money is to be spent for the farmers, I want the farmers to get the benefit of it and get it first-hand and not get it alone by these little pamphlets and things that are published here and sent out. Bulletins are useful, but my farmers need and are looking for something more than a bulletin to read and advise them how to grow crops that they can not sell.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, it ought not be necessary for me to say anything on this amendment. The membership will understand this is a research bureau. This is a real, scientific bureau. Its laboratories are located in Washington. The scientists and chemists must work in the laboratories; and if this money is to be transferred to be spent out in the field among the farmers, then we would be required to make another appropriation and move the laboratories to the country.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Do you not have these test fields already?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, we have little experiment stations here and there, where there are men in charge; but the real

research, the scientific, chemical research, is conducted in the big laboratories here in Washington, where they have microscopes and all the other instruments necessary.

Mr. ALLGOOD. How are they going to know about weather conditions and the conditions of the soil and climate down in Alabama and Florida and Texas if they do not have their scientists down there face to face with the problem? They can not do it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This is not the Weather Bureau. It is the Bureau of Chemistry. The soil is a totally different operation. Soil surveys are made in cooperation with the counties, the land-grant colleges of the States, and the Bureau of Chemistry. Field men go out and make those soil surveys under the appropriation as now allocated, but this amount provided for expenditure in the District of Columbia is for the scientific laboratories, to conduct the operations in the laboratories and achieve something. The Bureau of Chemistry has achieved as much or more for agriculture and for science than any other Government institution in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLGOOD. If they have achieved so much, it would seem as though agriculture is now in the worst condition to-day it has ever been.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Goss) there were ayes 9 and noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five are present, a quorum.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 52, line 23, for the purpose of offering an important amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, that point of order is dilatory, because the Chair has just counted and found a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has counted a quorum and will not entertain the point of order raised by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ALLGOOD. But the Members who were in the Chamber when the Chair counted a quorum have returned to the cloakroom.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes a quorum is still present. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT

For carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory-bird treaty with Great Britain (39 Stat., pt. 2, p. 1702) by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservation for the adequate protection of such birds; and authorizing appropriations for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes," approved February 18, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 715-715r), \$89,525, authorized by section 12 of the act, which sum is a part of the remaining \$882,000 of the \$1,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and in addition thereto the unexpended balances of the sums made available in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1933 for the purposes of sections 12 and 18 of the act of February 18, 1929, are continued available for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1934.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: Page 63, after line 9, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Cheyenne Bottoms migratory bird refuge. The unexpended balances of the appropriation of \$50,000, contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1930, and of the appropriation of \$200,000 contained in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932, shall remain available until June 30, 1934, for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled

"An act authorizing the establishment of a migratory bird refuge in the Cheyenne Bottoms, Barton County, Kans.," approved June 12, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 16, secs. 691-691d), and for necessary expenses incident thereto, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a new appropriation; it merely makes available for an additional year an appropriation which was contained in the agricultural appropriation bill last year and in the previous year. It appropriates money for the purchase of what is known as the Cheyenne Bottoms Migratory Bird Refuge, a very important refuge located in Barton County, Kans., and the only refuge in that part of the United States for a distance of some 300 miles in any direction, a refuge which is located at a strategic point along the line of flight of ducks and other waterfowl from the breeding places in Canada to the winter feeding grounds and resting places along the Gulf coast.

This appropriation, as I say, has been available for two years and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget for this year. The Biological Survey has had great difficulty in acquiring title to the land, not primarily because of any question over the price, but because the title to a great deal of it was defective and it has been necessary to resort to condemnation proceedings. There are 75 different tracts of land involved in this purchase. It has taken considerable time and investigation to survey the tracts, to locate the boundaries and to get the title in shape to bring the condemnation proceedings. Altogether \$33,000 of this appropriation has been spent.

To discontinue this work now would mean that \$33,000 has been thrown away; whereas if this appropriation can be continued for an additional year, this land can be acquired at a price which is reasonable and which is less than it could have been acquired for at any time in the past, and probably less than it can be acquired for at any time in the future. This project is a part of a great system of refuges which this country is going to establish to carry out the terms of the migratory bird conservation act and our treaty with Canada for the protection of migratory birds. This refuge is an important link in that program. We are going to have to acquire it at some time; and at this time when the money has already been appropriated, when it does not involve any new expenditures from the Treasury, we should go ahead and make it available for another year.

I believe that the conservation of our wild life is just as important as the conservation of any of our other natural resources. The statistics show that there has been a steady decrease in the number of wild fowl in this country for a number of years. This is not due to the fact that they have been hunted and shot so much as it is to the fact that their natural breeding grounds and refuges have been destroyed through drainage and like operations. The result is that to-day, if we are going to maintain anything like the number of waterfowl we have had in the past in this country, we must establish these refuges. We must establish them soon if we are going to conserve this great natural resource, and I therefore say that it is economy and real economy to at this time make this appropriation available for another year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the attempt to purchase the Cheyenne Bottoms as a bird refuge was made when the special bill was passed by Congress specifying that that bottom, that particular land, should be bought. That confined the Government to the purchase of that land. The owners of it conceived the idea that if the Government bought at all, it would have to buy that land. As a result, the department which would make the purchase of this land advises me that the owners are asking as high as \$25 an acre for this land as a bird refuge. Had this special bill, which I believe was passed in 1930, never been passed, this land, when the general migratory bird refuge act was passed, might have been purchased for \$4.50 an acre.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The proceeding now, of course, is in condemnation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. HOPE. I understand the condemnation suit is practically ready to be filed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not know about its being ready to file, but I am advised by the department that the owners wanted as high as \$25 per acre, \$10 per acre, \$15 per acre, and that they had in contemplation condemnation proceedings, but no suit has ever been filed, and they have had two years in which to purchase this land, but they can come to no agreement about it.

Mr. HOPE. The delay has not been on the part of the Government but has been on the part of the landowners.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It has been on account of the price, unless the department misinformed me.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will.

Mr. HOPE. I understand that one reason for bringing the condemnation proceedings, and one reason the Government has not made any further attempt to purchase this land, is because of the defective condition of most of these titles, which makes it necessary to take the matter into court in any event.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It has not yet got to the title stage; they have not yet got through with the investigations and approvals of the tracts.

Mr. HOPE. That is the information I received from the department, and I made a very careful investigation of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I can not help that; the fact is they have not got to the title stage yet.

Since this special act was passed, this Congress passed the general act providing for bird refuges throughout the United States. Under this general act we bought 79,000 acres of land; by gift and Executive order there has been set aside altogether between 225,000 and 250,000 acres of land with hundreds of bird refuges throughout the United States already established. This being the case, this committee decided it would be good policy to stop the purchase of all land, whether for bird refuges or for forest land, until we got out of this depression. So we cut out the appropriation for forest land under the Weeks Act, we cut out the appropriation for the purchase of further bird refuges under the general act, and we cut out the appropriation for the purchase of the Cheyenne Bottoms land under the special act.

There is not a cent in this bill for the purchase of land further than to carry out some contract the Government may have already made to buy land, and we ask that this policy of the committee be approved until we get beyond this depression.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BANKHEAD). The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads, including salaries and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, office and laboratory fixtures and apparatus, traveling and other necessary expenses; for conducting research and investigational studies, either independently or in cooperation with State highway departments or other agencies, including studies of highway administration, legislation, finance, economics, transport, construction, operation, maintenance, utilization, and safety, and of street and highway traffic control; investigations and experiments in the best methods of road making, especially by the use of local materials; studies of types of mechanical plants and appliances used for road building and maintenance and of methods of road repair and maintenance suited to the needs of different localities; and maintenance and repairs of experimental highways, including the purchase of materials and equipment; for furnishing expert advice on these subjects; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same; and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and reports; to be paid from any moneys available from the administrative funds provided under the act of July 11, 1916 (U. S. C., title 23, sec. 21), as amended, or as otherwise provided.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the other day under general debate, when we were considering the matter of public roads, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] stated that the appropriation for roads required \$3,600 per person employed. I have made some investigation concerning this matter since and find that the figures that were furnished the gentleman from New York—and I do not dispute them except to say that they may, as given here, create a wrong impression—were based on the pay roll and expenditures on the project and do not take into consideration such items as transportation, making of materials, loading gravel at the pits, and a great many other things that might be mentioned. So the figure of \$3,600 should really be divided by three, because it is estimated by the bureau—and the figures are found in hearings conducted before committees of Congress—that for each man actually employed on the project there are at least two others who are employed in the other ways I have mentioned.

Moreover, these figures were furnished at a time when the bureau was working under the special emergency act, and I may say for the benefit of the committee, that if the figures were now revised it would be found that much less is required per person. So that the figures left unexplained, that were mentioned the other day, might convey a wrong impression as an entirely different situation now obtains.

Since the work has been finished which was authorized under the special emergency act, we are operating on a much cheaper basis. Moreover, we did write into that act a provision that wherever possible men and teams should be employed, unless it would make the cost excessive. The practice now followed in many of the States, and I understand this policy is approved by the Bureau of Public Roads, is that men and teams shall be employed instead of machinery wherever practical.

Mr. Chairman, the fact remains that the road appropriation is one of the greatest for furnishing employment. Generally speaking, throughout the country, I think it perhaps furnishes more labor than any other appropriation made by the Federal Government unless possibly it is the flood-control work.

In my own State, as I mentioned the other day, we have had something like 8,000 or 8,500 men at work on the roads this year and this work has been rotated. Men of families have been given preference and not the same men employed all the time. The work is allotted in many cases. It has been one of the greatest blessings in my State in the furnishing of employment that has come to us during this depression.

I wanted to make this explanation because the figures given by the gentleman from New York standing alone and unexplained might create a wrong impression with reference to the labor furnished by the appropriations for public roads.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. You are one of the most active members of the Roads Committee and I wonder if the gentleman can tell us if there is any disposition on the part of the Committee on Roads to make any authorization for expenditures, either for the period ending July 1, 1934, or for the ensuing two years, or can the gentleman give us any idea what is going to be authorized during the next period of two years, so that the States may be advised as to what action should be taken during the present legislative sessions?

Mr. COLTON. The Roads Committee has already reported out a general authorization bill for \$100,000,000 for each of the two next fiscal years. There are some other special authorizations provided for in that bill. This bill is now on the calendar and I earnestly hope will soon be passed by this House. Unless it is, the States will be very greatly handicapped in their road-building program, and unemployment will be more widespread. I hope the leadership of this House will give us a rule at a very early date for the consideration of the road authorization bill.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to make a few statements in regard to the status of national aid for roads. I thoroughly agree with what has been said by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] in regard to the importance of highway construction during this period of depression.

I am advised by the Director of Public Roads, Mr. MacDonald, that in the month of October, 1932, there were 333,000 men actually being paid wages for highway construction under money expended by the Federal Government and matched by the States. This does not include road work done by States and counties. Of course, under the emergency appropriation the States are not required to match the fund.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON] asked about the status of road funds for 1934 and 1935.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALMON. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. This is a very interesting and important question not only to the Members of the House but to the country at large. May I ask the gentleman with respect to the information he got from the Bureau of Public Roads, whether it was indicated how this distribution was made throughout the States with reference to employment? I think that would be of general interest, and I hope the gentleman will incorporate that in his remarks.

Mr. ALMON. They may have a record of that. I have not a record as to how many are employed in the various States, but that can be obtained from the Bureau of Public Roads.

I am also authorized to state that only one-third of the men employed are employed by reason of highway construction alone. Mr. MacDonald says that 333,000 men are actually engaged in highway construction, paid out of money appropriated by the Federal Government and by the States, and that twice that number, making in all about 1,000,000 men, to-day are engaged in highway construction and in the preparation of materials. The men who work in the mines and in shipping and in unloading material are twice as many as those who are actually on the pay rolls of the contractors, according to the estimates of the Bureau of Public Roads.

So there are at least 1,000,000 men to-day engaged in the preparation of materials and in highway construction as a result of Federal aid to roads.

The question has arisen, What are we going to do in 1933 and 1934? At the last session of Congress the Senate passed a bill authorizing \$125,000,000 for 1933 and \$125,000,000 for 1934; 1933 begins next July. This bill came over here and was reported by our Committee on Roads, of which I am the chairman, authorizing an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for each of these years, and also so much for forest roads, and so on. This bill is on the calendar of the House to-day, and I am expecting to ask the Rules Committee at an early date to give us a hearing and let this bill come before the House and let the House determine whether we are going to continue national aid to roads.

I have made a rather thorough canvass of the House, and I find the general sentiment of the Members is that we can not afford now to discontinue national aid to roads.

I was a member of the committee and helped write the first national road legislation in 1916. I have kept in touch with the subject ever since, and I know the sentiment of the country. Some people say we can not afford to spend the money. My friends, last season we gave \$120,000,000 as an emergency fund and the year before \$80,000,000. It is folly to talk about discontinuing national aid for roads when more people are unemployed than ever before in the history of the Nation. There are 1,000,000 men employed in road construction and in the preparation of materials. I believe that the representatives of the people are going to vote for the bill when it comes before the House for consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama have two minutes more in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it advisable for his committee to appear before the Rules Committee and secure an opportunity for the House to act on this legislation at the earliest possible time? So that if the House adopts the measure, it will give time enough for the Appropriations Committee to make such appropriations as may be required.

Mr. ALMON. I agree with the gentleman. It is my purpose to appear with a delegation before the Rules Committee next Tuesday morning, and I hope that every Member interested in this matter will appear at that time. That will give plenty of time for the appropriations to be made before the 1st of July.

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMON. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. Your bill provides for an addition to the appropriations in this bill?

Mr. ALMON. The appropriations for the Bureau of Highways are satisfactory in the Buchanan bill, except there is one feature where I will offer an amendment making the same appropriation for flood control for Alabama as there is for Georgia and South Carolina, and I think the chairman of the subcommittee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this bill carries \$35,000,000 for Federal aid for roads, and I further understand there is \$51,000,000 left from the present or standing authorization.

I have a letter from the State Highway Department of Missouri giving some information of the activities of road building in my State and the relief afforded to the unemployed through road building. It is as follows:

MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Jefferson City, Mo., December 20, 1932.

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: As you no doubt know, the Senate at its last session passed the regular Federal aid act for highways, amounting to \$125,000,000.

This bill did not pass the last House and as I understand it is still on the calendar. I also note that the President has recommended the discontinuance of Federal aid for the time being.

A careful check of the finances available for the next few years shows that without Federal aid we would be in a very weakened condition in regard to our State road program. With Federal aid continued until 1937 it will be possible for us to complete our farm-to-market system in line with our promises made, and to make dustless our main-traveled gravel roads and take care of the traffic relief conditions around St. Louis and Kansas City. Without Federal aid we will not be able to complete our farm-to-market system and could not change our gravel-type surfaces to anything better.

In view of this situation, I hope you can see your way clear to support the passage of the Federal aid bill when it comes up for a vote.

In addition to our highway needs I might call your attention to the fact that our highway program has enabled us to keep from 13,000 to 16,000 men employed in road work in Missouri, which has been a material factor in relieving the unemployment situation in our State. To cut this work off at this time, I am sure, would be very unwise.

Yours very truly,

T. H. CUTLER, Chief Engineer.

Mr. Chairman, I think I am the only Member in this House who on this floor as far back as 1928 advanced the idea that we had arrived at the point where we could discontinue Federal aid for good roads, but I insisted ample notice should be given to the States.

Missouri has provided for a road program, expecting Federal aid, and properly so, to complete that program. If the State does not get the money from the Government, it can not complete the farm-to-market roads. If the Government refuses the State Federal aid when the State has perfected a program on the basis of past authorizations by Congress, it will deprive the farmer of his market roads. The main roads have all been completed, and it is now a

question of giving the farmer proper roads to connect with the main highways.

I live in a city, and the people there are satisfied with the roads already constructed, but feel the farmer should receive his farm-to-market roads.

We do not agree on a road program over night. The States have the right to expect Federal aid, so long as Congress does not indicate the policy is to be discontinued.

I am willing now to set a date for the discontinuance of Federal aid to roads, but I say that that date should be three or four years from now and that we should not stop Federal aid to roads at this time. We should give the States proper notice.

Let me ask the chairman of the subcommittee why it is that the bill does not carry \$51,000,000 rather than \$35,000,000? Does the Bureau of Public Roads state this is sufficient?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Because \$35,000,000 is abundant money to meet all of the maturing obligations of the Federal Government to the States in the construction of roads until another Congress meets and has time to appropriate the other \$16,000,000. That is the policy that Congress has followed for the last 10 or 15 years—appropriating only so much money for public roads as is necessary to meet the obligations of the Federal Government to the States. This \$16,000,000 is not appropriated, but has been allocated to each State, and each State is contracting it out for the construction of public roads, so that the public-roads program is not retarded, hampered, or interfered with by appropriating only \$35,000,000 instead of \$51,000,000. The Budget estimated only \$39,000,000, and they fell short \$11,000,000 of the full authorization.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Then the gentleman can assure the House that this is ample money to meet any demands the States may make until the next Congress meets, and that is, calculating that it meets in December next?

Mr. BUCHANAN. On the authority of the Bureau of Public Roads I assure the gentleman that that is ample money to meet every obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. ALMON. And the Director of the Bureau of Public Roads made a statement to me this morning in exact accord with that made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes. I have secured the information I desired.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand it, the subcommittee has provided in this bill all of the money that the Bureau of Roads indicated to be necessary which up to this time is authorized by law. That is correct, is it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. All that is necessary; yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. All that is necessary and asked for by the Bureau of Public Roads and authorized by law?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. About \$16,000,000 is authorized but not yet appropriated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Let me say at the outset that I am in favor of the construction of good roads when we can afford them, but this appropriation illustrates very forcibly the criticism directed at Congress and government in general, because the Government has failed to retrench its expenditures and adjust itself to its income in this emergency, as individuals and business have had to do, and because it continues a great many services, which might well be discontinued until conditions improve. The people who are paying taxes—home owners, farmers, and business men—in many instances, have about reached the end of their resources; and they can not understand why the Government does not reduce its appropriations and its expenses,

the same as they have been obliged to do and the same as charitable institutions and practically every organization of whatever kind and every family have been obliged to do. I wonder if the Members of the House realize how much has been appropriated in the last few years by the Federal Government as aid to the States in the construction of highways. I have before me the statement of the Bureau of Public Roads made to this subcommittee. It shows, under the subtitle "Project Statement," that there was expended in 1932, \$129,805,187. Then in a footnote we find that that amount was—

exclusive of \$58,912,432 expended in 1932 on account of advances to States under the emergency construction act of 1930.

That makes a total of expenditures by the Federal Government in the year 1932 alone of over \$188,000,000. We come next to this fiscal year 1933.

Estimated, 1933, \$132,651,496.

And that is—

exclusive of \$85,000,000 estimated expenditures 1933 on account of advances to States under emergency construction act of 1932.

Or a total of Federal appropriations for this one fiscal year as aid to the States in the construction of highways of over \$200,000,000. It is now proposed by the members of the Committee on Public Roads to go before the Committee on Rules to ask for an authorization to continue these appropriations for the fiscal years 1934 and 1935 to the extent of \$100,000,000 for each of these years. Under the economic conditions of the country as they exist to-day there is no justification for such additional authorization. We ought to stop these appropriations for the building of new highways altogether until conditions improve. This bill carries an appropriation of \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, without the passage of the resolution to which the chairman of the Committee on Public Roads refers, authorizing additional expenditure. We ought not to make this appropriation, to say nothing of authorizing an appropriation for still more.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Has the gentleman any figures to indicate what part of the \$58,000,000 or the \$85,000,000 was expended in loans to the various States to take care of their emergency relief on account of destitute people, which is to be charged against these highway funds in 1934, 1935, and 1936?

Mr. MAPES. I have no itemized statement showing how the money was spent or is to be spent, but the statement of the Bureau of Public Roads is that it has been used in the construction of highways. It is a lot of money in these times. Mr. Chairman, the fact should not be overlooked that the Federal appropriation is not the only appropriation made for the construction of roads. We have a wonderful set-up as far as the building of roads is concerned. We have the Bureau of Public Roads of the Federal Government, every State has a State highway department, then there is a county road commission in every county of every State, and on top of that a highway commissioner in every township. It is almost an endless chain. All of these different bodies are asking for appropriations in their own right for the construction of highways, and when we appropriate \$200,000,000 as aid to the States, that means that the States have got to match that appropriation in order to get their share of it, and that in itself encourages the States to appropriate another \$200,000,000, or a total of \$400,000,000. I repeat that it seems to me that, in this time of depression, when men are losing their homes, when business men and institutions, big and little, are going bankrupt, because of high taxes, we might well afford to stop this appropriation for the construction of highways altogether, for a time at least. I say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON] and the other members of the Committee on Roads, that as far as I have been able to ascertain, that is the sentiment of my congressional district; at least it is the sentiment of the great majority of the people in the district.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman understands that the bill authorizes only \$100,000,000 for each of the next two fiscal years to be used on Federal-aid highways.

Mr. MAPES. Yes; but this appropriation carries \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1934 without that authorization.

Mr. COLTON. That \$35,000,000 is a part of that previously authorized that was not used, and in effect carries it forward into the next fiscal year.

Mr. MAPES. That is true, but it is money just the same, and has to be raised in some way.

Mr. COLTON. The question I rose to ask is this: Does not the gentleman realize that the labor that has been furnished on these roads has saved thousands of men's homes in this country? But for this work they would have had no money whatever.

Mr. MAPES. But how many has it aided in losing their homes because of inability to pay taxes?

Mr. COLTON. I do not think any.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Does not the gentleman believe that the protests with regard to the additional appropriations, which come from business men, come with very poor grace when it is considered that the main purpose of the additional appropriation is to take care of their unemployed?

Mr. MAPES. It seems to me that the appropriations the Federal Government makes for the purpose of taking care of the unemployed do not accomplish that result because such a small percentage of the money appropriated gets to the unemployed. The increased burden by way of taxation greatly overbalances the good that is accomplished and retards recovery, very greatly to the detriment ultimately of the unemployed themselves.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Of course it would be far more desirable to have direct relief.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman understands, of course, that the several States have prepared programs in advance for some two or three years, and they must be advised as to how much money will be appropriated before they can make out their programs.

Mr. MAPES. They ought to be advised by this Congress that for the present we are not going to make authorizations for any appropriations in addition to those already made.

Mr. HASTINGS. But the authorizations having been made, they have already adopted programs for the next year, and if we are going to slow down in these authorizations or appropriations, there should at least be notice given to the States some two years in advance.

Mr. MAPES. My understanding is that we have made no commitments as far as the fiscal year 1934 is concerned, and that we have met all of our obligations up to date.

Mr. ALMON. There is no authorization for the fiscal year 1933 or 1934 yet.

Mr. MAPES. There is pending a bill to authorize an appropriation for 1934, but Congress is not committed to it.

Mr. ALMON. That is what we want to get. We want to get a commitment.

Mr. MAPES. Yes; I know you want an additional commitment.

Mr. ALMON. I think, considering the views of all the people of the Nation, the gentleman from Michigan is in a wonderful minority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that this authorizes the use of \$35,000,000 of an authorization of \$125,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, 1933. Hence that would leave the re-

mainder authorized for the fiscal year 1934, and hence it does cover the next two years. I mean both in appropriation and in authorization.

Mr. MAPES. I may say to the gentleman that this discussion has come up before the reading of the section to which the gentleman refers, but my understanding is that that \$125,000,000 to which the gentleman refers was authorized for the year 1933 and this bill proposes to appropriate this amount out of the unexpended balance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I object. I want three minutes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes to discuss a matter which has not yet been discussed in regard to this provision.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I would like one minute.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that legislation can not be enacted on an appropriation bill, but I wish to call to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Roads a criticism that I hear in Alabama in regard to Federal aid. It is along this line, that the specifications are so high that it requires about eighteen to twenty thousand dollars to construct a mile of highway. Of course, the State is supposed to put up a part of that appropriation.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLGOOD. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. We can only participate up to \$15,000 per mile.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Well, I hear that criticism of high expenditure. Fifteen thousand dollars is the least specification that they will accept?

Mr. COLTON. It is my understanding that the Federal Government can only participate in cost of roads up to \$15,000 per mile.

Mr. ALMON. The Federal Government can only spend that much on a mile, and the State can spend just as much as it wants to.

Mr. ALLGOOD. In Randolph County, Ala., some oil concern is building an asphalt road for about \$3,500 a mile as against the expenditure on these national highways of eighteen or twenty thousand dollars a mile. I notice in Pennsylvania they are building roads for the farmers, which cost \$3,000 per mile, reaching out into the rural sections. They are good roads. They are asphalt roads, and they are roads that will stand up for years, built of asphalt. They are comparable to the cement roads. I feel that we have built enough roads in this country for the tourists, and I think the Committee on Roads ought to take this suggestion in hand and see that these requirements are reduced so that we can get more farm-to-market roads.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I have been wondering during this discussion if any of the other States have a situation comparable to that in my State. I notice by the report that in 1932 \$2,814,478 was furnished by the United States, which Colorado had to match. In addition to matching that we spent \$2,000,000 more.

During the present year the representatives of the United States stated to us that they could help take care of the poor in our outside counties and that if the outside counties did not repay the United States then repayment money would be withheld from the money hereafter to be allocated for highway funds.

When I come to look at the authorizations I find there are no authorizations for any highway funds beyond this year.

I talked to members of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON], and I talked to the gentleman who operates the Bureau of Public Roads, Mr. MacDonald. They do not know anything at all about it except that there is a bill pending in Congress which would provide \$100,000,000 to cover the annual needs of the ensuing 2-year period.

I also found from the Bureau of Public Roads that they have a program going into the future for about six years; for the present 2-year period contracts and drawings and other arrangements have been made which are going to be put into effect and completed; the next ensuing 2-year period, which is the next part of the program, and then the last period of two years, so that there is a continuous program. But as far as dollars and cents are concerned the present money authorized in this bill before us to-day is to take care of the existing contracts between the several States and the Bureau of Public Roads, and there is no authorization at all by this Congress either for the building of roads or to protect the United States, if you please, against these loans that are being made to many of the States of the Union to take care of the poor and indigent people in various counties.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman understands that in addition to the basic road act Congress has adopted the policy of passing an authorization act every two years, determining how much will be appropriated for the next biennium; and we do not by any authorization act ever bind Congress more than two years in advance.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. That is the situation we are in right now. The next 2-year period has not been authorized; and in addition to the actual road building that is going to be done here are also these amounts, aggregating tens of millions of dollars that have already been advanced to various States and distributed as poor relief in various counties upon the statutory authorization that if the counties do not pay them back they shall be withheld by the United States Treasury from the road relief fund.

What action is the roads committee taking as to this amount of money, and what is going to be done in the various States?

Mr. COLTON. There is nothing in the regular acts of Congress which authorizes an arrangement of this kind. This is purely an arrangement by the gentleman's State, as I understand it.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. On the contrary, the gentleman will find in what is called the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 that very provision is made; and it is in operation. The requirement is that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be reimbursed by making annual deductions, beginning with the fiscal year 1935, from regular apportionments made from future Federal authorization in aid of the States and Territories for the construction of highways and rural post routes.

Mr. COLTON. That is in the emergency act.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. That is not in the regular authorization bills, however.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Has any arrangement been made to take care of these amounts except to guess that the United States is actually going to reduce the amount of road building? How are you going to take care of it? Are you going to increase the amount of the appropriation, or are you going to reduce the amount of road building in these States that have not paid the money back?

Mr. ALMON. The argument of the gentleman from Colorado shows the importance of passing this authorization bill, so that the States and highway commissions and the legislatures of the various States can determine what amount must be raised in order to match the Federal-aid fund.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. One reason that makes this so important to my State—and the legislature in my State may be different from that in any other State of the Union—is because only during the first 15 days of the session may bills be introduced.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate that the Record should show in closing this debate precipitated by the gentleman from Michigan that the additional appropriation for roads was brought about as a necessity to take care of the unemployment situation, and that business men and industrialists have no ground to complain. Originally the system of Federal highway aid was brought about by the advent of the automobile and as a means of stimulating that industry. The State of Michigan has no ground to complain.

Mr. MANLOVE. Mr. Chairman, I desire in the one minute at my disposal to interrogate the gentleman from Colorado. The gentleman from Colorado argues that we should not, as I understand it, make this appropriation at the present time by reason of the fact that Congress, or the Government, has made loans to different States upon the proposition that we may retain part of their Federal aid if they default in the repayment of those loans. It appears to me that this is no time to contemplate whether these States are going to default or not, and for that reason, proceeding in the even tenor of our way, it seems to me the present appropriation should be authorized, because you can not presume that some time in the future a State is perhaps going to default, and for that reason withhold the present appropriation.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MANLOVE] has evidently misunderstood me. I have not argued that the appropriation bill now reported by the Committee on Roads should not be passed. I am trying to direct the attention of the House and the Committee on Roads to the possibility that money has actually been lent to the States which may not be repaid, under which circumstances the amount thereof is already provided by the emergency relief statute to be deducted from Federal aid highway funds which have not yet been authorized.

The Clerk read as follows:

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355-359), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, including not to exceed \$872,009 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, \$35,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is a part of the sum of \$125,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, by section 1 of the act approved April 4, 1930 (46 Stat. 141), after deducting \$15,840,743.86 in making the apportionment of said authorization to the States, in accordance with the act of December 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 1031): *Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be directly employed, except this provision shall not apply to convict labor performed by convicts on parole or probation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$45,000 of the funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921 (U. S. C., title 23, secs. 21 and 23), shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles necessary for carrying out the provisions of said act, including the replacement of not to exceed one such vehicle for use in the administrative work of the Bureau of Public Roads in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That whenever performing authorized engineering or other service in connection with the survey, construction and maintenance, or improvement of roads for other Government agencies the charge for such services may include depreciation on engineering and road building equipment used and the amounts received on account of such charges shall be credited to the appropriation concerned.

Mr. MAPES and Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order against the paragraph and would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman kindly state his point of order for the benefit of the Chair?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure of my point of order, but my understanding of the situation is this:

Congress has passed no legislation authorizing appropriations for Federal aid to the States for the construction of highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934. The purpose of my inquiry of the chairman of the committee is to ascertain what the authorization is for this particular appropriation of \$35,000,000 and what makes it in order without legislation having been passed authorizing Federal aid to the States for the fiscal year 1934.

Mr. SANDLIN. I will state to the gentleman that this is just the remainder of an old authorization. This has already been authorized.

Mr. MAPES. And we are carrying that forward in this appropriation bill?

Mr. SANDLIN. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will permit, my recollection is that the law provides that this appropriation shall not expire for two years, and this amount of time is required to provide for the commitments already made.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order, but while I am on my feet I would like to ask the chairman of the committee another question.

Mr. SANDLIN. The chairman of the committee is not here, but if I can answer the gentleman I will be pleased to do so.

Mr. MAPES. It happens that I received a letter this morning from a constituent who desired to work for a contractor who had a contract for the construction of some Federal-aid roads in my congressional district. He was told by the contractor that he was unable to employ him because he had to employ veterans. I looked up the law for 1932 and saw that it did contain a provision that required contractors to give preference to veterans with dependents if they were qualified for the work.

Mr. SANDLIN. That is in the emergency act, is it not?

Mr. MAPES. I notice that provision is left out of this bill. Why is that?

Mr. SANDLIN. I understand that provision was only carried in the emergency bill.

Mr. MAPES. But there is carried in this bill the provision that prohibits the use of any of this fund on highways where convicts are employed, and that is in the same section of existing law as the provision relating to the employment of veterans. I wondered why one was retained and the other was left out.

Mr. SANDLIN. As I understand, that was a limitation put on the bill last year.

Mr. MANLOVE. If the gentleman will permit, that limitation was carried in the authorization bill and the money we are now appropriating comes from that same authorization bill. Therefore, the same provision would follow with respect to this appropriation.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It was my amendment on one of the appropriation bills that had to do with the employment of convicts, and then, as the gentleman from Louisiana has pointed out, the provision with respect to preference being given to veterans was contained in the emergency bill.

Mr. MANLOVE. This money is a part of the emergency bill money.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet perhaps I should also make some reference to the comment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] about this unemployment feature of the highway fund. I have great respect for the gentleman from New York and for his humanitarianism, but he is not the only one that is in sympathy with men out of work or the only one who would like to help them in every possible way.

It seems to me those who are out of work generally must get employment through the regular channels of trade, and how the gentleman from New York or anyone else can hope to restore these industrial plants that he speaks of until they have some relief from tax burdens, as well as other burdens, so that they can open their factories and give employment to the unemployed, I do not understand.

Let me say further that it is not the industrialist particularly who is objecting to the continuation of these high-

way appropriations. The farmers in my congressional district very generally are opposed to the continuation of these appropriations until conditions are better, and because Michigan may have advocated the construction of highways 10 years ago, when we were at the height of our prosperity, is no particular reason why we should not discontinue them now, with economic conditions as they are.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 64, line 24, strike out "\$35,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the thing upon which industry and farming are waiting a revival from this depression is sound economics on the part of the Congress of the United States. The people are fearful of going ahead with business. The farmers are unable to get prices because everybody is in a state of fear. Is it not about time that we in Congress who have been intrusted with the responsibilities of carrying on the Government should come to realize that only by stopping this wild-cat wave of expenditure can we restore confidence to the people and start the wheels of industry turning and start the prices of farm products mounting to a point where the folks can get along and make a living? Every move we have made in the line of appropriating large sums of money has been to destroy confidence and to stop the return of prosperity.

Every single move we have made has driven men out of work instead of putting them to work, because they have prevented the people from going ahead because they did not dare.

Now, the Democratic President elect came out for economy the other day, but did he come out for that economy which might produce results and restore the confidence of the people? Oh, no; he came out for economy by consolidation. Did you ever hear of consolidation saving money? Consolidation does not save money. The things that save money are wiping out useless bureaus and cutting down expenditures. The things that save money are cutting down appropriations.

Now, here we appropriated \$800,000,000 in 1933 for construction projects of one kind or another, and on these projects we can cut down almost all of them.

I stated the other day the cost of putting a man to work on these projects—and I stated it from figures I received from the different departments of the Government. It has been stated that there are a million men working on the highways at this time and upon correlated projects. Two hundred million dollars expended and a million men would give \$200 a man. It has never been supposed throughout the length and breadth of the United States that men would work for \$200 a year.

The fact is that most of this money goes to the contractors and very little of it trickles down through to the workmen. I do not believe the direct and indirect employment of men is over 200,000 at this time.

Now, I think we have got to stop. This is not a contract authorization; we do not have to appropriate the money. The money is not contracted for under the law until it is appropriated. This is the time for us to stop and we ought to stop now. We ought to stop appropriating money for these jobs.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. It is my understanding that the \$35,000,000 in this bill is to take care of projects for which contracts are already made.

Mr. TABER. Contracts can not be let under the law until the appropriation is made. Authorizations for money to be

appropriated was contained in the law of 1930. I looked that up before I came here.

Mr. COLTON. I feel sure that the gentleman is in error and that the contracts have already been let for this \$35,000,000. They were authorized by law.

Mr. MANLOVE. In the State of Missouri the roads department has contracted for work which aggregates twenty times as much as the Federal contribution. The program is based on a proportionate part to be carried in this appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. I do not understand that, because I do not believe the law allows it.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The gentleman may be right, that contracts have been entered into. The roads department states that they have entered into agreements based on the Federal aid.

Mr. TABER. Here is the situation: The law of 1930, and I looked it up a moment ago, does not provide for contract authorization. Some of the previous laws did, but this does not, and we should cut down this appropriation and stop this spending of money. It is the only source of relief that we can give. Cut down on the appropriations and give the people a chance to work out of this trouble.

Mr. ALMON. This \$35,000,000 is to be used to carry out contracts already made and in force.

Mr. TABER. They have no right to be made.

Mr. ALMON. They are authorized under the law.

Mr. TABER. Not under the law.

Mr. ALMON. They were.

Mr. TABER. That is not what the law of 1930 says. I hope the House will adopt this amendment.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am sick and tired of hearing remarks made here and elsewhere throughout the length and breadth of the land that Congress destroyed the confidence of the people, that Congress caused the present unemployment, and that Congress is responsible for the existing deplorable economic condition of the country; I deny that Congress had anything to do with bringing upon this country its present economic ills. Minds that can conceive of no better remedy for the present depressed condition of business than merely cutting expenditures are minds that have failed to note or understand what has happened in this country. Business to-day is anemic. Further contraction of the circulating medium can only make a bad situation worse. The guilty parties who are responsible for present conditions are now moving heaven and earth to divert the bitter resentment of the American people from themselves and to throw the odium upon the Federal Government.

I read in the newspapers and in the magazines propaganda sent out from Wall Street by the international bankers and by the big industrialists, telling the people that prosperity will return if they can only make Congress "keep the Government out of business," have fewer laws passed regulating the trusts, and allow the industrial Insulls free play. Their propaganda pictures the American Government as a colossal Juggernaut whose burden is breaking the backs of the American people, robbing them of their homes, and destroying their business.

Cutting the salaries of Government employees and doing away with benefits for veterans will not save the citizen his business or his home if this unemployment continues much longer. You never see in this propaganda any mention of the burden of debts or the high interest rates. No; it is always "taxes" and "Government expenses." Why, if we should stop every expenditure on the part of the Federal Government for a whole year, it would not make any appreciable difference so far as the economic depression is concerned.

You know and I know that before the crash the international bankers had bled this country white, sending \$5,000,000,000 of real money to South America and Europe in exchange for their worthless securities. [Applause.] Wall Street sold a trusting American public, as investments, billions of dollars of paper that is not worth 5 cents on the

dollar. Industrialists have pyramided holding company on top of holding company, and saddled the consumer with public-utilities charges far in excess of what was necessary to run the operating systems. These are the guilty ones who are to blame for this situation.

Of course, we should not spend a single dollar of the taxpayers needlessly, wastefully, or extravagantly. Of course, we should practice economy. But to come in here and say that we are guilty of bringing the country to its present deplorable condition, that we are guilty of keeping it there, is poppycock broadcast by selfish high-powered propaganda to divert attention from those who are guilty of bringing this condition upon the people of America. We must put the spotlight of publicity on the real culprits and keep it there if we are to make certain that past evils are to be remedied and that this deplorable condition is not to occur again. [Applause.]

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman? I ask unanimous consent to close all debate upon the public highway items in 11 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 11 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very much surprised at the attitude that some of our colleagues have taken with reference to public road building. I think the gentleman who has just spoken, the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], has voiced the correct origin of this sentiment and propaganda that is put out to stop the aid of the Federal Government in building highways. I was very much surprised at the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] a moment ago in his opposition to the bill. He spoke of his district and how the people there were opposed to the building of highways. If I remember the gentleman's district correctly, there are only two counties in it. Is that correct?

Mr. MAPES. But I say to the gentleman that they are very unusual counties.

Mr. GLOVER. Oh, yes, unusual, because they are in the gentleman's district. The opposition that is being voiced here comes from just that kind of source. No man who will drive over this country and see this great Nation of ours coupled and linked together with public highways will stand on this floor and vote against Federal aid to States in the building of highways. Some time ago somebody on a tour of inspection went through a section of our State at a point where there happened to be an unfinished section not yet sufficiently strong for concrete, and they severely criticised it. That sort of criticism is very hurtful to the State, and yet it shows how important public roads are. The thing that has made our Nation great is our public highway building, cooperated in by the States and the Federal Government. For us to cut down this appropriation from \$35,000,000 that is now authorized under the law to \$10,000,000 is absolutely unthinkable. I do not believe five men in this House who will seriously think about this matter will cast their vote for such an amendment. I think it is offered for the sole purpose of trying to create a prejudice against the Federal Government's cooperating in building our national highways.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And to cut it down from \$35,000,000 to \$10,000,000 would be to have the Federal Government repudiate its solemn obligation.

Mr. GLOVER. Absolutely. I was just coming to that point. In the States now, as some one remarked a moment ago, the legislatures are meeting, and they are planning ahead and expecting not only the Government to carry out this obligation in carrying out the contracts already let, but they are looking to the future. They had a right to do that under the law. There is not a lawyer on the floor but knows that even a county judge, if he has a dollar in

the fund for the building of bridges, can go out and contract for a bridge and make the contract legal.

This is a legal contract entered into by the Government, and the Government ought to carry it out.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not also true that this appropriation has already been cut by the committee \$187,000,000?

Mr. GLOVER. Absolutely so; and it ought not be cut at all. It ought to be enlarged, if possible. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] said a while ago, this is to help in the relief of the unemployed, and spends a dollar where we get a dollar's worth of work for every dollar that is put out. That is the way the Federal Government ought to be spending money.

I saw the gentleman the other day when there was a proposition before the House where we could save some money, when his own President had not recommended it, when the Budget had not recommended it, yet he was willing then to vote \$460,000 for an institution out here, when it was not authorized nor asked for by the President in his Budget. Economy is a great thing, but it ought to be practiced at all times. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 13, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 65, line 9, strike out the word "directly."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, when I offered an amendment on the appropriation bill last year and the year before, placing a limitation on the expenditure of this appropriation so that convict labor could not be employed, there was some apprehension that the States could not adjust themselves. We found that every State has adjusted itself to the employment of free labor, with the exception of two States, where convict laborers are used to the extent of the purchase of stone that had been crushed by the convicts.

I am sure there is no intention on the part of those two States to violate the limitations on the appropriation bill, and the misapprehension has been caused by reason of the word "directly" used in the limitation. I have a letter from the American Federation of Labor, dated December 19, 1932.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As far as I am concerned, I will not oppose the amendment, as I want to get along with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Road and bridge flood relief, Georgia and South Carolina: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the relief of the State of Georgia for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929," approved May 27, 1930, and the act entitled "An act for the relief of the State of South Carolina for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929," approved June 2, 1930, the unexpended balances of the appropriations for these purposes contained in the second deficiency act, 1930, shall remain available until June 30, 1934.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, a copy of which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALMON: On page 67, after line 7, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Road and bridge flood relief, State of Alabama: The unexpended balance of the appropriation contained in the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1930, for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act for the relief of the State of Alabama for

damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929, approved March 12, 1930, shall remain available until June 30, 1934."

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. I would like to hear the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, this is placing the appropriation for flood control in the State of Alabama on a parity with that in the States of Georgia and South Carolina, in the preceding section. It was unintentionally left out. The chairman of the committee during the hearings said he thought all of the States ought to be put on a parity. This amendment places this appropriation for flood control on a parity with Georgia and South Carolina. It makes it available until June 30, 1934.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMON. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. How many other States might be affected by this same matter of unexpended balance, that would have relief to them? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. ALMON. I think there are not any except Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina. Those are appropriated for and provided for in this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. And the gentleman might include Kentucky and Vermont.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, that was simply an oversight on the part of the committee. We want to treat Alabama the same as the other States. It was just an oversight.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agricultural engineering: For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture, independently or in cooperation with Federal, State, county, or other public agencies or with farm bureaus, organizations, or individuals; for investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation and the best methods to apply in practice, the different kinds of power and appliances, the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits, the duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water, the customs, regulations, and laws affecting irrigation, and the drainage of farms and of swamps and other wet lands which may be made available for agricultural purposes; for preparing plans for the removal of surplus water by drainage; for developing equipment for farm irrigation and drainage; for investigating and reporting upon farm domestic water supply and drainage disposal, upon the design and construction of farm buildings and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and storing farm products, upon farm power and mechanical farm equipment, upon the engineering problems relating to the processing, transportation, and storage of perishable and other agricultural products, and upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the act approved April 19, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 7, secs. 424, 425); for giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins, plans, and reports; and for other necessary expenses, including travel, rent, repairs, and not to exceed \$5,000 for construction of buildings, \$375,000.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 68, line 21, strike out "\$375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$350,000."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is to eliminate from the bill an item of \$25,000 for "the development of mechanical equipment for corn-borer control." During the great scare five or six years ago caused by this bogy worm, known as the European corn borer, Congress appropriated at one time \$10,000,000. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture have repeatedly told us they did not request that \$10,000,000 and they should not be charged up with it. They said that Congress was responsible for that. The Congress honestly believed the great corn

industry was in jeopardy. With that money, among other things, the department purchased hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of machinery, and quantities of this machinery are stored at different places throughout the United States at the present time. Since that time they are spending more money in providing new machinery or remodeling the old to destroy a pest that in 25 years has caused practically no damage over the United States. Twenty million dollars has been expended on this comparatively harmless pest, and still you go on year after year expending more money.

Now, the committee made a big reduction in the appropriation of last year. We are making a cut of \$247,087 from the bill this year, and yesterday the House took out \$13,968 additional in supporting an amendment that I offered. But here we are proposing to expend \$25,000 to devise machinery to destroy a pest that has not caused any damage of consequence over the United States in all the years it has been here. In my opinion, this is a needless expenditure, and I am against it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman undertake to reflect the views of the Representatives from those States that are directly interested in this proposition?

So far as I am concerned, that would be a very essential piece of information for me to have. If this appropriation is not necessary and if the States where the corn borer has threatened to be a great pest are willing for this appropriation to go out, I think it ought to go out; but if this were a matter affecting the cotton section of the country I would want to have the opinion of those interested in the cotton industry. Can the gentleman give us any information along that line?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I can give the gentleman this information. A number of Members of Congress from the Corn Belt have told me they are opposed to the corn-borer appropriation, and some of them have spoken here against it. I recall Mr. Hogg, of northern Indiana, one of the great corn areas of the country, has spoken repeatedly along with me against this appropriation. Mr. Wood, who represents a corn-growing section of northern Indiana, has also spoken against it. Mr. Ludlow also has expressed himself against it. I do not at the moment recall any others.

I am speaking on the testimony that has come before our committee during the past several years, not with prejudice, certainly, against any agricultural product or any part of the country; but because the testimony, in my opinion, does not warrant the expenditures we have been making. True, we have been cutting down for the past two years, but I think we have spent entirely too much. We are still spending too much. We have not done this with respect to any other pest that I know of in the United States. The Congress and the country, in my opinion, are needlessly scared.

I would not deprive any State of the Mississippi Valley or of the great Corn Belt of any appropriation that would be of real benefit to them or to agriculture in those States. What I say is based on the testimony that has come before our committee and from a very genuine interest in agriculture and also in the people's Treasury.

I want to repeat here what I said to certain witnesses before our committee. I quote:

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to these two witnesses, representing the organizations that they do, that my attitude as a friend to agriculture and horticulture in every respect is certainly well established. I am for maintaining quarantines or making investigations or whatever is necessary in regard to any and all of these pests that are really destructive. But I want to suggest, very respectfully, that your organizations start in systematically to reeducate this country in regard to what the corn borer has not done and is never going to do. We have spent, over my vigorous and persistent protests, between eighteen and twenty millions of dollars on a pest that has never done to exceed a hundred thousand dollars of damage in any one year in this country in the 25 years that it has been here. You have those quarantines because of the yellow journals, and that movement has been furthered by many scientific men. If you want to get rid of useless quarantines and do not want to have these impediments put on your legitimate business, you had better take the situation in hand and start reeducating the people.

The corn-borer problem has been solved; and it is perfectly useless to spend millions of dollars in quarantines against celery, and to have silly things of that sort going on because of the scare that has been built up in the minds of the people. The Agriculture Department has long since demonstrated that reasonably clean farming is the remedy for the corn borer. They have also told us positively and repeatedly that it can not be exterminated and its spread can not be prevented. As long as I am in Congress, I shall continue to oppose wasting the taxpayers' money. Tell the people the whole truth about the corn borer and the quarantines will soon disappear, and big expenditures will not be necessary.

These witnesses agreed with me and you will also agree with me and vote to save this \$25,000 if you read the testimony before our committee for the past five years.

The European corn borer is the bogy worm of agriculture.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the House ought to adopt this amendment. Understand, gentlemen, the corn borer is not in our section at all, and as chairman of this committee I am trying to treat every section of our country absolutely alike.

They had a convention recently upon the corn borer, its destructiveness, its spread, and recommendations that should be made to Congress for appropriations. This convention was composed of all the entomologists from the corn-borer and surrounding States, including the commissioners of agriculture and other citizens interested in that section of the country. They passed resolutions not only recommending as much as the Budget has recommended but going farther and recommending larger appropriations by Congress. If you take the infested area as a whole, they do not want Government activity stopped in keeping up with the corn borer. They want its history studied with the idea of seeking out poisons for it or seeking farm machinery that will get rid of the stalks more cheaply than the machinery they have now.

Now, let me tell you what I did, and I was afraid I had gone too far, because I am not from what you would call a corn State. Mr. SANDLIN, who is on the committee, is not from what you would call a corn-producing State. Doctor SUMMERS is from a State that produces the least corn of any State in the Union. Mr. HART, of Michigan, is not from a corn State and, unfortunately, Mr. SIMMONS was not present. I was afraid, not being from corn States, we might do this section an injustice.

The Budget recommended for this specific item, that Doctor SUMMERS seeks to strike out, \$53,000. The committee cut it down to \$25,000. The convention recommended a great deal more than the Budget had recommended. What is its purpose? It is just a sufficient amount for the Bureau of Agricultural Engineering to test out the practicability, the cheapness of operation, and so forth, of machines and inventions turned out by private industry, to see whether they can give these people a machine that will cut their stalks and clean up their ground and cover their stubble more cheaply than the machinery they now have. This is going to come, in my judgment. The control of the corn borer, in my judgment, is going to come to the question of cultivation, the question of cleaning up of stubble, of burying the stubble, and I think it is vital that the best machinery possible should be developed for the benefit of these people. I therefore hope you will vote down the amendment.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very actively interested for a number of years in this campaign to eliminate the corn borer. Going back three or four Congresses I stood on the floor and assisted others from our section of the country in securing adequate appropriations to combat this pest. We have been going through a very extensive campaign of investigation, education, and development of mechanical contrivances of one sort or another to eliminate this pest. We have established quarantines in the States, have broadcast methods of elimination and control, and all together it seems to me that farmers throughout the country have been very abundantly educated as to the best methods of controlling this pest.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I have only five minutes.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I just wanted to find out from the gentleman whether the corn borer has yet got into the heart of the Corn Belt.

Mr. KETCHAM. If it ever does get into the heart of the Corn Belt, may I say that all the information both as to methods, kind of machinery, and every other phase of the work has been supplied abundantly and can be used by those who want to inform themselves as to the best method of eliminating this pest.

Speaking for the State of Michigan, where we have had infestations by this pest, I think I accurately reflect the sentiment when I say that a majority of our farmers have become convinced that this campaign has gone as far as it ought to go, and they are now ready to say to the United States Government that we are willing that the appropriations for this particular purpose shall be discontinued except in so far as the items have to do with continuing investigations as to parasites that may kill off the corn borer or other practical things in the way of studies of this kind that naturally must continue.

For that reason I assured Doctor SUMMERS that I will be very glad to go along trying to eliminate appropriations in this bill that have to do with items like this or where I think full information and full knowledge has already been supplied by the Federal Government very liberally, but I think that is as far as we ought to go.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I yield.

Mr. PETTENGILL. I want to say, coming from an adjoining district to the gentleman in the State of Indiana, if I correctly interpret the sentiment of the farmers of that vicinity they are against any further expenditure of Federal money for this purpose.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have not attempted to strike out the appropriation for parasite work.

Mr. KETCHAM. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to pay a tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine attitude he has shown in connection with this very item. Coming from a section of the country where they have no pests of this sort, he has indicated his willingness to include this item and has been more than fair in urging that it be included.

And may I say that in taking this position in opposition to the particular amendment I do not want him or the subcommittee to feel that I am trying to detract in any way from the splendid efforts of him or the subcommittee in the reductions they have reported.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read an excerpt which I think may change the mind of the gentleman from Michigan. This is from the department.

In Canada between 1922 and 1926 corn acreage in two counties was reduced from approximately 1,200 square miles to 40 square miles due to the corn borer. Under enforced control by the Dominion Government and by the practice of clean plowing, low cutting of corn, and other means proposed by the agricultural engineers, corn production in these counties has practically returned to the 1922 status.

That demonstrates that the only effective method is through clean plowing, low cutting of the corn, destroying the pest below the stubble.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I say in reply that the excerpt the gentleman has read is a complete answer to the whole argument. It is through the culture of parasites, the low cutting of corn, thorough plowing, and destruction of host plants that this pest can be most effectively controlled. Our farmers are informed and alert and sufficiently interested to control this pest whenever it becomes a real menace.

Then, referring to the investigation before our committee, the evidence clearly indicated that the corn borer had a natural habitat immediately adjacent to the Great Lakes, and that when you get on the higher ground remote from lakes there is not so much danger of its spreading.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KETCHAM) there were—ayes 36, noes 34.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. SUMMERS of Washington to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 39, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of chief of bureau and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$267,750.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Olson, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, testified before this subcommittee. He furnished some interesting testimony in regard to farm mortgages. He introduced some tables that are also very interesting, as well as his comments on the farm-mortgage situation. I want to say a few words about that, and in order that I may discuss it more fully I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes instead of 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, on page 739 of the hearings on this bill Mr. Olson has inserted a table showing the farm mortgages held by the principal classes of lending agencies on January 1, 1928. It discloses that the farmers owe about \$9,468,000,000 on their farms. The Federal land banks of the country hold 12 per cent of this indebtedness. I sent to the document room a few moments ago and asked for a copy of all of the bills that propose some kind of a moratorium on farm-mortgage debts, and Mr. Lewis, in charge of the document room, sent me all the dozen or more bills which you see in my hand. I have discovered that, without exception, these bills ask that a moratorium be granted only on mortgages held by Federal land banks. I invite your attention to the fact that Federal land banks hold only 12 per cent of the total mortgage indebtedness of the farms of this Nation. The joint-stock land banks hold 7 per cent, the commercial banks 10 per cent, and the insurance companies 22 per cent. The following table compiled by Mr. Olson is self-explanatory:

Farm mortgages held by principal classes of lending agencies, January 1, 1928¹

Lending agencies	Percentage held by each agency	Amount held by each agency
	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Millions of dollars</i>
Federal land banks.....	12.1	1,146
Joint-stock land banks.....	7.0	667
Commercial banks.....	10.8	1,020
Mortgage companies.....	10.4	988
Insurance companies.....	22.9	2,164
Retired farmers.....	10.6	1,006
Active farmers.....	3.6	339
Other individuals.....	15.4	1,453
Other agencies.....	7.2	685
Total.....	100.0	9,468

¹ Estimated by Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

If we are going to have a moratorium on farm mortgages, in order that it may be effective it should include all of the companies making loans to farmers on their farms. To help 12 per cent, or those who have borrowed from Federal land banks, would help some, but it would not be as helpful as extending the same aid to those who have borrowed from other lending agencies.

REAL-ESTATE TAX PER ACRE

On page 767 there is a table showing the estimated real-estate tax per acre on all farm lands has increased from 1913, when it was 52 cents an acre, to \$1.25 per acre in 1930. These taxes are paid by the States, counties, cities, and districts. The Federal Government does not levy a tax

on land. It is an interesting table, and I hope you gentlemen will examine it very carefully.

DEPOSITS REDUCED IN COUNTRY BANKS

On pages 780 and 781 you will find a table inserted which shows the indexes of net demand deposits in country banks, and he has taken for 100 the period of time between 1923 and 1925, and he shows that the deposits have decreased in banks in the leading agricultural States from 100 in 1925 down to 55 in 1932, and in the Corn Belt States from 100 in 1925 down to 55 this year. In the Cotton Belt States the deposits have decreased from 100 in 1925 down to 40 in 1932. Evidently that is one problem that we should deal with in this Congress. The agricultural States do not have sufficient money.

BANKRUPTCY, EXPANSION OF CURRENCY, OR REVOLUTION

I spent the last week-end in Texas. On the train, in the stations, in the hotels, everywhere you find people gathered you hear them talking about economic conditions and economic affairs. I wish I could say that I really believe conditions are getting better, but I can not truthfully say it. Conditions are not getting better but are getting worse, and the people are beginning to realize that one of three things must happen. First, if conditions are not improved in some way, we are facing bankruptcy or repudiation of debt. I do not even like to say the words, but we might as well face the facts. Second, a way that we can prevent that, and I am not talking about any proposal of my own or of any other Member of this House, and that is the expansion of the currency. The currency may be expanded with silver, or by an expansion on the gold base, or by devaluing the gold dollar.

Third, if we do not expand the currency so the value of all dollars, including gold, will be reduced, so people can pay their debts on somewhat the same basis as they were contracted, we are going to have some kind of a revolution or change in this country. Instead of some members worrying about whether or not they are going to be reelected after two years from now, they had better be giving serious consideration to whether or not they will serve out the two years they have been elected for. We are facing a serious situation in this country. People are starving. Did you know that people are actually starving, and this Congress can do something to relieve that condition?

RELIEF SHOULD NOT COMMENCE ON TOP

We should not start putting out money at the top with the hope that the money will percolate down to the needy and poor, but we should start at the bottom. This morning I noticed the following in the Washington Post:

A family of four—man, wife, and two little boys, 2 and 3 years old—was discovered yesterday morning in a box car in the Potomac freight yards by Arthur Powers, railroad policeman. The family, all of whom were suffering from exposure, had made their way from New Orleans, approximately 1,500 miles, in the same box car without detection. The man told Powers that he was trying to make his way to New Haven, Conn., where he had been promised work with a motor company.

The family was brought into the yard office and Paymaster Granville Studts was notified of their plight. He immediately started a collection among the men at the yards, with the assistance of J. O. Gallagan, and in a few minutes \$25 was raised. The family was then taken to Washington and placed aboard a bus for New Haven, and the money left after payment of the bus fare was given the mother.

He was riding in this railroad box car, going to New Haven, Conn., in the hope that he would find employment there.

YOU NEVER SEE A WOMAN IN A BREAD LINE

Labor, a paper published in Washington, discloses some interesting information. I want to read it to you:

"FORGOTTEN WOMEN," RELUCTANT TO BEG, STARVE IN COLD GARRETS All but neglected for three years, one of the most tragic phases of the depression—the plight of unemployed and homeless women—was brought to the foreground this week when the Washington Travelers' Aid made an earnest plea in their behalf to Secretary of Labor Doak.

Spokesmen for the organization disclosed that Miss Mary Anderson, Director of the Women's Bureau, has been working without success for many months to get the condition of these unfortunate

women before the Government and the public in such a way as to force effective action.

The problem has become so acute that New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other large and small cities are being swamped with unemployed and destitute women, Doak was told.

Secretary Doak expressed the keenest sympathy and directed the Women's Bureau to continue to cooperate with other organizations interested in the problem. Unfortunately, the bureau is without funds to properly press the work.

Practically no provision has been made for their care. Because they hesitate to beg on the streets or resort to bread lines, many of the homeless women are literally starving to death in cold garrets and other out-of-the-way places, according to Miss Beatrice Hodgson, assistant director of Travelers' Aid.

Mrs. John J. O'Connor, a director of the organization, said the remedy is to absorb these women into their home communities and to provide them with shelter and welfare. This is absolutely necessary if their morale is to be maintained, she declared.

The Family Aid Society recently issued a report on homeless women and girls that is one of the most appalling narratives in the dismal history of the depression. It said there are actually "thousands of forgotten women" who are "clinging desperately to life," and that unless they are given intelligent treatment the country may pay a "frightful toll in moral as well as physical degeneration."

Almost the identical words were used by the Unemployment Relief Committee of New York in describing conditions in that city, which it declared to be "terrible beyond description."

OPEN FORUM FOR MEMBERS

I believe this condition can be remedied. We have in this House what is known as an open forum for the discussion of economic affairs. It is not a partisan body, and it does not meet with the hope or expectation of doing anything that is antagonistic to the present leadership or to the duly constituted committees. I believe it was first called by my friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]. About 60 or 70 Members of this House belong to that open forum. It is divided into groups—the farm-mortgage group, the farm-aid group, the currency-reform group, and the city-cooperation group. I am a member of the group on currency reform. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY] is chairman of that group. He has called a meeting of that group for next Thursday evening. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC], who is secretary of the whole group on economic relief, which embraces all four groups, has just informed me that a meeting of the whole committee has been called for next Tuesday evening at 7.30 o'clock in the Judiciary Committee room. Mr. SUMNERS of Texas is chairman. It is an open forum on economic relief. All Members are invited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret to object, but if we go into these foreign problems we will never get through with the bill under consideration.

Mr. PATMAN. I desire to discuss what Mr. Olson said.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It would take two hours to discuss what Mr. Olson said, and then somebody else would want 5 or 10 minutes.

However, I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CURRENCY REFORM GROUP

Mr. PATMAN. I want to insert the names of the present membership on the currency-reform group: BUSBY, chairman, MONTET, SOMERS of New York, FIESINGER, SPENCE, HOWARD, ARENTZ, McSWAIN, CHRISTOPHERSON, HANCOCK of North Carolina, MAY, PARSONS, LAMNECK, DeROUEN, GILBERT, HILL of Alabama, KVALE, JOHNSON of Texas, WITHROW, VINSON of Kentucky, McREYNOLDS, and PATMAN. Our meetings are nonpartisan. It does not make any difference whether you are a Democrat or a Republican or a member of any other party. We are studying for the purpose of trying to arrive at some conclusion as to what will be best for the welfare of the entire country without regard to politics. I have never attended more interesting meetings than I have attended at the meetings on currency reform. The meetings usually last from an hour to two hours, and never has a Member left while a meeting was in progress.

SEVERAL WAYS TO EXPAND CURRENCY

In regard to expanding the currency, of course, some people will say we can do it overnight by silver. Possibly we can. But many people contend there will have to be a conference with other nations of the world in order to make it effective. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS], chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, has given a great deal of time and attention to that subject and has introduced a bill, H. R. 13000, to carry out his plan. I hope the Members will examine it. It is a very interesting bill and possibly will be very helpful if it does not solve the problem. But there is another way of doing it, and that is by devaluing the gold dollar. There is much consideration being given to that proposal. A gold dollar is 25.8 grains, nine-tenths fine by law. If we devalue that gold dollar and say that "hereafter it shall be 12.9 grains gold, nine-tenths fine," just half as much, I am doubtful if that will help the situation any, because the value of gold is determined not so much by the scarcity of gold but by the scarcity of dollars, paper dollars, paper currency, and silver.

The reason gold is so high is because the currency is so high. So, instead of devaluing the gold dollar by cutting it in two and making two gold dollars out of every one gold dollar—although some economists say it would be very helpful, I am inclined to believe it would not have any effect at all. There is one sure way to expand the currency, and that is to issue money; carry out the constitutional mandate for Congress to coin money and regulate its value. I do not mean to have our country go wild, as Russia and Germany did, and print money as long as the money is worth more than the paper it is printed on, but to have some regard for the monetary gold stock, population, income, and wealth of the Nation.

EXPANSION SAVES HOMES

May I say here that I do not uphold the people of Russia and Germany in printing so much money, but I will say that no person lost his home in Germany or Russia by inflation. People only lose their homes in deflation, and people are losing their homes by the thousands to-day all over this Nation. We can not reduce taxes very much. It is true we can reduce some, but most of our indebtedness is by reason of bonded indebtedness, payable in gold of a certain weight and fineness. So the only thing we can do is to make those taxes easier to pay and make those debts easier to pay. That can be done by expanding the currency.

SUFFICIENT GOLD TO ISSUE \$5,000,000,000 MORE MONEY

We have in our country to-day, subject to the control of this Congress, if this Congress desires to exercise the power over it, \$4,500,000,000 of gold. We recognize the fact that whenever the country has 40 cents in gold behind every dollar of paper there is ample gold reserve to back up that paper money. Figure it out for yourselves; we only have five billions in circulation now. How much more money could be issued on that gold base? Certainly \$5,000,000,000 more money can be issued. We can balance the Budget that way and use this other money for any other purpose desired and thereby place more money in circulation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read down to and including line 23, on page 70.

Mr. LOZIER. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, on December 14 and 15, while the Post Office appropriation bill was being considered, I called attention to the maladministration of the merchant marine act and the extravagant and indefensible contracts made by the Post Office Department with steamship lines and aircraft concerns for carrying foreign mails. I listed 27 steamship lines that were beneficiaries of our extravagantly administered ship subsidy system. For carrying our overseas mails, these 27 companies, operating un-

der 36 contracts, were paid \$18,790,765.72, while the standard rates under section 4009 would have been only \$2,925,216.25. In addition to the standard rates for carrying ocean mails, these 27 companies received a bonus, subsidy, or so-called subvention amounting to \$15,865,548.97, or approximately five times the poundage rate.

If this same mail had been carried by ships other than those having contracts under the merchant marine act the Government would have paid for that service only \$2,925,216.25, but as this mail was carried by a favored group of ships qualifying under the provisions of the merchant marine act, the Government paid for this service \$18,790,765.72, or more than six times the standard rates. According to the recent report of the Postmaster General, the total number of routes under contract on June 30, 1932, was 44. The transportation of foreign mail cost the Government \$29,500,000 for the fiscal year 1931, \$36,600,000 for 1932, and for the fiscal year 1933 the appropriation was \$38,695,000. Approximately \$7,000,000 of each of these appropriations was for carrying our foreign air mail.

Prior to the passage of the merchant marine act the transportation of our overseas mail was paid for on a weight basis. On ships of American registry, the compensation was at the rate of 80 cents per pound for letters and post cards, and 8 cents per pound for other mail, including parcel post. On ships of foreign registry, the rate was 3 francs a kilogram, or about 26 cents a pound, and for other articles including parcel post, 40 centimes a kilogram, or about 3½ cents per pound. The rate paid American vessels is based on an act of Congress, and the rate for foreign vessels is based on the rate prescribed by the Universal Postal Congress for a single maritime transit. These rates are still in force and all steamship lines not enjoying contracts under the merchant marine act are compelled to settle upon this basis.

Now, the merchant marine act grants a governmental subsidy to certain steamship companies operating American-built steamships, owned and officered by American citizens, in conformity with law, or so owned and officered and registered according to law, and who employ a certain quota of American seamen. This bonus is not paid as an outright subsidy but is granted in the form of excess payments for the transportation of mails destined to foreign ports. Under the ingenuous and elastic provisions of this act shipping lines secure mail contracts at rates largely in excess of the compensation paid under the general law, which is on a weight basis. These contracts under the merchant marine act are on a mileage basis, the price ranging from \$1.50 to \$12 per nautical mile on each outward voyage, without regard to the amount of mail transported.

Suppose one of these favored shipping lines, operating and subsidized under the merchant marine act, carries a handful of letters from New York City to Cape Town, Africa, a distance of 6,786 nautical miles, it will receive compensation for this service at a rate ranging from \$1.50 to \$12 per nautical mile, depending upon the class, or speed, or tonnage of the vessel, the maximum charges being as follows:

Class 1 vessel of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 20,000 tons, and capable of maintaining a speed of 24 knots at sea in ordinary weather, \$81,332, or \$12 per nautical mile.

Class 2 vessel of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 16,000 tons, and capable of maintaining a speed of 20 knots at sea in ordinary weather, \$67,860, or \$10 per nautical mile.

Class 3 vessel of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 12,000 tons, and capable of maintaining a speed of 18 knots at sea in ordinary weather, \$54,288, or \$8 per nautical mile.

Class 4 vessel of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 10,000 tons, and capable of maintaining a speed of 16 knots at sea in ordinary weather, \$40,716, or \$6 per nautical mile.

Class 5 vessel of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 8,000 tons, and capable of maintaining a speed of 13 knots an hour, \$27,144, or \$4 per nautical mile.

Class 6 vessel of a registered tonnage of not less than 4,000 tons, and capable of maintaining a speed of 10 knots at sea in ordinary weather, \$16,965, or \$2.50 per nautical mile.

Class 7 vessel of a gross registered tonnage of not less than 2,500 tons, and capable of maintaining a speed of 10 knots at sea in ordinary weather, \$10,179, or \$1.50 per nautical mile.

Moreover, under certain conditions the Postmaster General is authorized to increase these maximum rates and to waive tonnage requirement where speed is especially important on particular routes.

According to the report of the Postmaster General, the merchant-marine subsidies or differentials favoring vessels of American registry cost the Government \$18,911,474.60 in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1931, while for the same year the excess cost of airplane service over the postage revenues derived from air mail was \$17,167,501.04. These two subsidies aggregate \$36,078,975.64, which represents the cost to the American people in the year 1931 for subsidizing our air and ocean mail services.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932, the merchant-marine subsidies or differentials favoring vessels of American registry cost the Government \$21,666,102.89, while for the same year the excess cost of airplane service over the postage revenues derived from air mail was \$20,586,107.31. These two subsidies for the year 1932 aggregate \$42,252,210.20, which sum the American people are donating to our air lines and merchant-marine fleet. These extravagant bounties not only helped to unbalance our National Budget but necessitated a substantial increase in Federal taxation.

If wasteful expenditures of this character are to continue our Budget will never be balanced, and the people can not expect any reduction of their tax burdens. These ship and air mail subsidies are gratuities paid out of the Public Treasury for the enrichment of a favored few at the expense of the masses. The policy of granting subsidies is contrary to the genius and spirit of our institutions. It robs Peter to pay Paul. By a gift of public funds we stabilize and make profitable the shipping and airplane industries, while other vocational groups drift rapidly toward economic disaster.

Table 18 accompanying the recent report of the Postmaster General shows the total postage or revenue from our international mail for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932, was \$18,015,293.30, and the expenditures for transporting these mails were \$46,426,997.46, the excess of expenditures over revenues being \$28,411,704.16. This is a sample of many wasteful expenditures that have in recent years kept our Budget out of balance.

From 1907 to 1917, inclusive, transportation of our foreign mail cost the Government approximately \$3,000,000 annually. For the years 1918 and 1919, the World War period, the cost averaged about \$4,000,000 annually. Then came the merchant marine act of 1920, under the administration of which the cost rapidly increased, averaging \$7,000,000 per year for the years 1920 to 1928, inclusive. In 1928 the present merchant marine act was passed, since which time there has been an enormous increase in the cost of carrying our overseas mail.

In 1929, the first year under the present act, the cost jumped from \$8,700,000 to \$19,050,000, an increase of \$10,350,000 over the cost for the preceding year. In 1930 the cost was \$26,400,000, an increase of \$7,350,000 over the cost for the preceding year. The cost in 1931 was \$29,500,000, which was an increase of \$3,100,000 over the cost in 1930. In 1932 the appropriation was \$36,600,000 or \$7,100,000 more than in 1931. For the year of 1933 the appropriation jumped to \$38,695,000, which was approximately thirteen times the cost in 1907, more than nine times the annual cost during the war period of 1918 and 1919, five and one-half times the average annual cost from 1920 to 1928 under the merchant marine act of 1920.

This saturnalia of wasteful expenditures of public funds illustrates the folly of vesting in a bureau chief or departmental head the power to make contracts involving tens of millions of dollars of public funds extorted from an already overburdened people. If the right to make contracts involv-

ing millions of dollars is vested in a bureau chief, extravagance and waste are as certain as that night follows day.

I submit a table showing the annual cost of transporting foreign mails, beginning with the year 1907:

Annual cost for carrying foreign mails

1907	\$3,005,064
1908	2,852,396
1909	2,765,789
1910	2,891,217
1911	3,031,930
1912	3,227,378
1913	3,485,506
1914	3,383,295
1915	2,989,899
1916	3,123,143
1917	3,232,354
1918	3,629,428
1919	4,357,665
1920	5,627,719
1921	6,010,002
1922	6,016,777
1923	6,508,972
1924	7,856,038
1925	7,500,000
1926	8,500,000
1927	8,000,000
1928	8,700,000
1929	19,050,000
1930	26,400,000
1931	29,500,000
1932	36,600,000
1933	38,695,000
1934	35,500,000

It is to the credit of the present Democratic House that the appropriation for the fiscal year of 1934, \$35,500,000, represents a reduction of \$3,195,000 from the appropriation for the fiscal year 1933. I am convinced that the Democratic House would have made much more drastic reductions but for the lamentable fact that the Post Office Department has hog-tied the Government by entering into 10-year contracts with these pap-sucking, subsidy-nourished shipping concerns.

The foregoing table shows the combined cost of carrying both ocean and air mails to foreign lands. The appropriations for transporting our foreign mails by aircraft in recent years were as follows:

1925	\$150,000
1926	150,000
1927	200,000
1928	200,000
1929	200,000
1930	4,000,000
1931	6,600,000
1932	7,000,000
1933	7,000,000
1934	7,000,000

At a later date it is my purpose to discuss in detail the unwise and wasteful policy of our Government in subsidizing air lines to carry mails to foreign lands, the major portion of which expenditure is for transporting mails to Latin American countries. But until I have completed my analysis of and comments on ocean mail subsidies, I deem it prudent to forego a discussion of air mail subsidies. I think each of these questions should be considered on its merits and without reference to the other, although the same principles are, to a greater or less extent, involved in both questions. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Pink bollworm: For the control and prevention of spread of the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation, the erection and repair of necessary inspection stations, and for necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, \$379,804: *Provided*, That the cost of each such station shall not exceed \$500, and that the total amount expended for such stations in one year shall not exceed \$2,500.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment and make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: Page 80, line 22, strike out "\$379,804" and insert "\$354,804."

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if there is not an increase of \$25,000 in this appropriation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is no increase over the Budget recommendation. The Budget figures were allowed. Twenty-five thousand dollars is added to the appropriation on account of a new infestation of pink bollworm in Florida. The \$25,000 is on that account. There are two infestations in Florida, one in southern Florida in wild cotton and one near Miami in domestic cotton. They think they can stamp them out and completely eradicate them for \$25,000. If they can do this, it will be a wonderful achievement and will prove a blessing to the country.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman if they have succeeded in stamping it out in Texas?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They have stamped out one infestation in Louisiana, one in northwest Texas, one in east Texas, and one in central Texas. This has been done with different infestations in different years. Along the border and along the Rio Grande, of course, they can not stamp out the infestation. If they did, the pink bollworm would immediately fly across the river, and for this reason we have never undertaken an eradication campaign along the border. We could do it, but they would immediately come across the river, and it would be no use and the money would be thrown away. Therefore all we do now is to keep the insect from spreading into the main Cotton Belt of the United States by inspection, fumigation, and by the enforcement of a number of regulations that the Members of the House know a great deal about.

Mr. ALLGOOD. And the gentleman holds it will take \$379,000 to do this work?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It has taken that amount, less \$25,000 which is on account of the new infestation in Florida. We operate fumigating plants along the border throughout this territory in conjunction with the State. The State maintains a quarantine.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Here is what J. E. McDonald, commissioner of agriculture of Texas, says in regard to it:

In 1931 production of cotton in the pink-bollworm infested area of the United States was 173,163 bales.

It looks like they are raising cotton in spite of the pink bollworm.

In 1931 the production of cotton in the pink-bollworm infested area of Mexico was 86,603 bales, making the grand total for the two countries, which embraces all the pink-bollworm infested area of the North American Continent, 259,766 bales.

What he proposes to do is to take the cotton that the United States Government has and repay the farmers down there and have a no-cotton area there for two years. He states it will be necessary in order to stamp it out, and it will cost about \$5,000,000 to buy this amount of cotton. This is a good hole to put our surplus cotton in if it will destroy the pink bollworm and get rid of the proposition, and he says it will absolutely do this.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Your committee does not believe in appropriating Federal money to be turned over to people in any area to pay them for the privilege of planting cotton. We do not believe in using Federal money for that purpose.

I want to state to the gentleman as to the whole problem that you can never eradicate the pink bollworm along the border of the United States. The United States can not do it alone. The only way to get rid of this most destructive of cotton pests on this continent is by an international agreement between Mexico and the United States and by a concerted and cooperative fight by both Governments. We have been trying to bring this about. The Mexican Government has indicated a willingness to undertake it, but "willingness" will not eradicate this pest. It takes money, and so far they have not indicated they would provide a sufficient amount of money. So there is no hope of eradicating this pest. We have just got to continue our

¹As approved by the House.

quarantine regulations and our supervisory and control measures until we do have an international agreement.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The people in Florida are not exercised over it, because their State legislature has not appropriated any money for this purpose.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman does not know whether they are exercised over it or not; and, in the second place, Florida is not a cotton State. The gentleman has not been down there. This is a new outbreak.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I just get what the gentleman has in the report of the hearings, and I have read what they have to say about it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALLGOOD].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

European corn borer: For the control and prevention of spread of the European corn borer, \$40,000.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 81, line 9, after the word "borer," strike out the comma and insert the following: "and for the certification of products out of the infested area to meet requirements of State quarantine on account of the European corn borer."

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment with the consent and approval of the chairman of the subcommittee. It also has the approval of the Department of Agriculture. No additional appropriation is involved.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is correct; we can better afford this expenditure than for the corn borer.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this language would enable the Department of Agriculture to take steps which would absolutely unlock a situation that is now threatening havoc to a large part of the vegetable production and horticultural industries of the country.

There is a real emergency involved, which has been caused by the cancellation of the Federal quarantine on account of the European corn borer. Immediately following the cancellation of the Federal quarantine, effective last July, States free from infestation immediately placed embargoes or quarantines against infested areas touching a great variety of products, including plants of corn, ear corn, lima beans, beets, rhubarb, and other vegetables. In the horticultural list these embargoes and quarantines were directed against practically all of the hollow-stemmed plants, running against such flowers as dahlias, asters, chrysanthemums, and so forth. The economic losses that would flow from a continuance of these embargoes are best guessed at by the Members from the States against which they are leveled. I know that my own State, New York, and my own district, Long Island, would receive a crushing blow, and considering the economic losses that the horticultural industry has already suffered there because of present disturbances they are not in any position to receive additional economic blows.

Eight States now have full embargoes against imports of these products from 13 others. Twelve States have restrictive quarantines against 13 others. But it is the embargo situation that this language is aimed to cure.

The States leveling these embargoes are not willing to accept State inspection certificates testifying that any shipment is noninfested. They are outright embargoes, and they will not modify them unless the Department of Agriculture steps in and issues Federal quarantine inspection certificates. These the embargo States would be willing to recognize. I have been assured by the Chief of the Quarantine Division of the Department of Agriculture that if this fund is made available for the issuance of Federal certificates that these embargoes will be turned into quarantines, and that shipments to the present embargo States can be made from infested areas provided they carry Federal inspection certificates.

It is a small cost to assure a tremendous benefit to the vegetable and horticultural interests of this country. As it is now the States of New York, Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia simply have all their usual markets for this class of products shut to them in the present embargo States. And only a Federal inspection certificate can free the threat.

Of course the department will not be able to maintain 100 per cent Federal inspection with the amount proposed, but it will be in a position so to coordinate State inspection and certificate work as to create confidence; and that is what is needed. It is my belief that this entire amount should be used for certification work alone, and it is also my understanding that this fund will be so used if this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the food and drugs act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906 (U. S. C., title 21, secs. 1-15), entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the revision of the United States Pharmacopoeia and development of methods of analysis, and for investigating the character of the chemical and physical tests which are applied to American food products in foreign countries, and for inspecting the same before shipment when desired by the shippers or owners of these products intended for countries where chemical and physical tests are required before the said products are allowed to be sold therein, \$1,185,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$4,280 shall be used for travel outside of the United States.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 8, strike out the figures \$1,185,000 and substitute therefor "\$1,135,000."

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have presented this amendment for the purpose of directing your attention to one more duplication of service as between States and the Federal Government.

We have in Michigan a very large production of fruit, and the spraying of it, particularly apples, has become a very important factor in marketing.

I presume most of you are familiar with many restrictions and regulations, requirements imposed on the apple growers of the country. A few years ago the question of arsenical residue on apples came up for consideration in a conference between officials of our country and Great Britain. The British authorities presented a very bad situation in that they claimed that many of the apples exported from the United States had a portion of arsenic remaining, as the result of spraying, that was injurious to health. They practically laid down the proposition to the Department of Agriculture that unless some very stringent regulations were imposed on the growers of this fruit they would make regulations amounting to an embargo against apples from this country.

That caused our own Department of Agriculture and this particular division of it to formulate regulations limiting the arsenical residue. Pending adjustments they allowed a very small tolerance, and this has been cut down and down and down until it has reached such a point that no one who sprays apples to-day in the ordinary way can expect to get into the export trade unless he installs an apple-washing outfit. He may do it either in a cooperative way or otherwise, under the regulations, but the sum total of it is that it involves considerable expenditure of money and a great deal of work, and consequently a great source of annoyance to the apple growers of the United States.

But the particular point where we have difficulty in our section—and I surmise the same difficulty is met by apple growers in other parts of the country—is not so much in the export business as it is in the interstate business. We do a

large business in our section by way of trucking apples to Chicago and other large centers. Most of our business in that particular line is interstate. This is what we run against: When, for instance, apple growers go into the city of Chicago they meet a double system of inspection. There is not only the inspection set up by the State of Illinois, possibly supplemented by the inspection set up by the city of Chicago, but, in addition to that, there is the inspection set up by the Government of the United States, and it is frequently a question of running a gantlet of inspectors from the time the shippers cross the State line until they reach the market in the city of Chicago. I think one can readily see that unless there is extra care in the administration of this law, great embarrassment, useless duplication of inspection, and loss in the marketing of perishable products is bound to occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to call this to the attention of those among you who I am sure may have experienced similar difficulties. I can safely say that among all of the administrative functions performed by the Department of Agriculture there is not one in our section that creates a greater degree of dissatisfaction or that brings more embarrassment and a greater loss to producers than the administration of this particular matter. It is, therefore, in my judgment, essential that we face this proposition, to see if we can not avoid some of this useless duplication and if we can not at least temper these regulations so that farmers who desire to market in this country shall not be subjected to the standards that may be deemed to be advisable by a country that has virtually compelled us to establish these regulations or destroy entirely the export trade in apples. In other words, it seems to me that it is about time that we in the United States of America set up our own regulations with reference to running our own business, and that we do not accept for our domestic marketing operations the dictates of health authorities across the ocean, who, I sometimes believe, have not been actually so solicitous of the physical health of their own people as they have been for the good business health of their producers of these products. I am very frank to say to you that I think these regulations that have been enforced by foreign countries, particularly Great Britain, have been imposed in an effort to keep out a superior quality of fruit such as we export.

I have taken this time to call this matter to your attention, and I sincerely hope this may receive more than just casual consideration, because literally thousands of dollars' loss and untold embarrassment and delay have been incurred, and this has caused more general dissatisfaction in my section than any other one department activity that has come to my attention.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. What is the present status of the controversy about apples between this country and Great Britain?

Mr. KETCHAM. The tolerance is the minimum imposed by Great Britain, and the gentleman can very easily understand that very rigid inspection is required. If there is an abundant apple crop over on the other side, and they do not care to have importations, they can become unusually exacting in the enforcement of their restrictions. But the particular complaint I have is that our own department subscribes to this standard for export trade and also sets up such rigid inspections in our own interstate trade, where growers are met at State lines by inspectors. Then when the shippers bring their product into the cities they are frequently met by a duplication of inspectors, and if, perchance, there should be an unfriendly administration in

the city, by still a third set of inspectors. It is just one inspector after another, and I say to you that the growers in my particular section are highly indignant over the arbitrary administration in this particular. It has its ground-work in the protection of the public health, but in my opinion has gone beyond that consideration, and in some instances it seems to me has amounted to persecution.

Mr. HASTINGS. I suppose the gentleman would not agree with me when I tell him that that is our tariff law just inverted and used by Great Britain. It is the same principle.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am not arguing the merits of the tariff nor the rights of Great Britain to impose these regulations, but what I do say is that I do not believe that that standard should necessarily govern in our own interstate commerce, and I certainly vigorously protest the duplication of inspection. It is for that reason I have taken the time to call the attention of the committee to this abuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Just a word, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment offered by Mr. KETCHAM of Michigan and the discussion on the amendment.

I come from one of the heaviest fruit-producing districts of the United States. Our State ships about \$50,000,000 worth of apples, and we have large quantities of pears, peaches, and prunes. To be sure, New York is a great apple State, also Virginia and Michigan, and so on.

The story of this inspection and the troubles we have had as far as it has come to my personal knowledge during the time I have been here, are these: Several years ago the city health officials of Boston, Mass., found fault with the amount of spray residue on some pears that were shipped to Boston. Seven carloads of pears were dumped into the bay, because of the spray deposit which could easily have been washed or rubbed off. That resulted in a conference in the Department of Agriculture. At that time, at my suggestion, we reached an agreement that if the fruit were handled with canvas gloves and most of the residue removed, they would not quarantine or find fault with it. During the hearing, I put the question to men from Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and many other places, as to whether they knew of any instance of poisoning by spray residue. There was a large number of men in the room, but not one man knew of a case of poisoning.

We do not muzzle the men and women and children who work in our orchards, and they eat this fruit indiscriminately and without injury. Nevertheless, the State of Washington, or any other State or the Federal Government, can not interfere with quarantine regulations of the city of Boston. Meantime, we had many conferences in the Department of Agriculture.

The story of the objection that has come from across the water is that many years ago poisoning occurred in England from arsenic in beer. At that time a tolerance of one one-hundredth of a grain of arsenic to the pint or the pound of beer was established, and that has been the tolerance on foods and drinks in Great Britain ever since. This is now generally accepted throughout the world. They require us to comply with their quarantine regulations. That works a very great hardship on us, but we must submit. We are building up a large foreign market for our fruits, so we must comply.

The next step was required because of eastern cities and foreign countries demanding that we wash the fruit. So it is first washed with an acid solution and then rinsed with clear water and comes out in a very attractive condition at this time. Our people greatly rebelled against this process in the beginning, but I believe, as far as our shippers are concerned, they no longer object, because it presents their fruit to the buyer in so much more attractive form that they think it pays them for the money expended in washing.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Does the arsenic go into the fruit at all, or is it just on the outside?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is just on the outside. It is not in the fruit at all. It is now all removed by washing, and has been for many years past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Meantime the department is undertaking to develop a spray material that will be poisonous to the codling moth and not poisonous to human beings. They found the natives of Sumatra using a fish poison. They dug up and crushed a shrub and tossed it into the stream. It killed or stupefied the fish and they came to the surface, and the natives ate them without injury. They started with the Derris shrub. It was very expensive to manufacture an alkaloid from that shrub, although it could be greatly diluted. They thought at first that it was poisonous to man, but in the course of time they found by experimentation that that was not the case. So they have been working on Derris. They found in the interior of South America, far into the interior, almost back to the Andes, another plant that has the same alkaloid, by the name of rotenone, and there they got another supply. They found the natives using it in the same way there. In the interior of Africa they also found still another shrub that the natives were using in the same way, that contained the same alkaloid, rotenone. So they have found three different sources. Some of these plants are being transplanted to the United States and grown here successfully. The extraction of rotenone has been much cheapened. Some companies are now, I believe, manufacturing this new, nonpoisonous-to-man spray material in a commercial way. Meantime the department is undertaking to develop a synthetic preparation to take the place of rotenone.

For several years I have sponsored a small annual appropriation to carry on this valuable research work.

It is believed we shall finally dispense with the lead-arsenic spray and supplant it by a much cheaper spray, nonpoisonous to man, that will not be quarantined against and will not require washing. The value of such spray to fruit and vegetable growers is almost beyond computation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to collect moneys due the United States on account of loans made under the provisions of the acts of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1347), March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 467), April 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 110), February 28, 1927 (44 Stat. 1251), February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1306), as amended May 17, 1929 (46 Stat. 3), March 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 78, 79), December 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 1032), February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1160), and February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1276), not to exceed \$350,000 of the repayments made during the fiscal year 1933 to the appropriations contained in Public Resolution No. 114, approved January 15, 1931, and in the Interior Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1932, approved February 14, 1931, to carry out the provisions of Public Resolution No. 112, approved December 20, 1930, as amended (46 Stat. 1032, 1160, 1167), is hereby made available, of which amount not to exceed \$55,000 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the hearings in connection with these seed loans and crop-production loans. That is an interesting story, beginning on page 980 and running through page 1010. It seems that the Secretary of Agriculture, with no authority in law, has reduced the mortgages on these crop loans from 75 per cent to 25 per cent. On the bales of cotton they have collateralized the loans on the basis of 9 cents a pound,

and they have now accepted collateral of two bales of cotton in place of three.

I want to call attention especially to page 1010 of the hearings where the Secretary and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] argued this matter out, where it was finally admitted that there was no legal authority. That goes back to the bill of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was passed by the House, and this item on loans on crop production and the seed loans is in a very precarious state.

I notice in the district of Minneapolis only 5 per cent of these loans have been collected. We have available \$122,000,000 in this act that originally called for some \$60,000,000, and so it goes. I wanted to take two or three minutes to call the attention of the committee to this part of the hearings. I believe this Congress should go on record and give authority in law, which does not exist to-day, for the collection of these loans.

We are appropriating under this paragraph some \$250,000 out of the revolving fund to collect the loans. This was not the intention of Congress when the bill was passed. I do not want to take any more time of the committee, but I did want to bring this to the attention of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The \$300,000 that the gentleman refers to has not anything to do with crop-production loans.

Mr. GOSS. They have to do with seed loans; that is true.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. And only 55 per cent of the money that we have lent from 1921 to 1931 has been collected; in fact only 27 per cent has been collected in money.

Mr. GOSS. I realize that.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. And they have warehouse receipts for the balance.

Mr. GOSS. I think this is something the Congress should thoroughly go into when we have more time. I realize we are pressed for time this afternoon, but I really wanted to bring this to the attention of the committee.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 52, line 23, of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: On page 52, line 23, after the word "analysis," strike out "\$410,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000."

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for already reducing this appropriation some \$19,000 below the Budget estimate, but it is a heavy appropriation for agricultural chemical investigation, for investigation and development of methods for the prevention of heating of agricultural products and the prevention of farm fires and fires in cotton gins, cotton-oil mills, grain elevators, and other structures, and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis, \$410,000.

I never knew until we got into this bill there were so many scientists and so many "bugologists." It seems that the farmer is being humbugged in this bill. I do not believe the farmers were ever aware that we had so many scientists. I will admit that science has played its part in the development of agriculture, but there is no scientist living to-day or no scientist who will live to-morrow who can take 5-cent cotton and develop the products in it and make the farmer prosperous. He can not take 15-cent corn, I do not care what he does, and make the farmer prosperous. He might make some corn liquor out of it and try to get away with that, but he could not sell it under the law, and besides they do not need scientists to teach them

how to make corn liquor. The same thing is true of 30-cent wheat, no scientist can take flour, shorts, or bran and make new products which will make the wheat farmer prosperous.

We have had years and years of investigation. Of course I know they are occasionally bringing about some new developments. I understand they have just recently brought a development with respect to some dye that has been worth several million dollars possibly to the manufacturers of cotton. Of course to a certain extent this gets back to the cotton farmer, but you can not take 5-cent cotton and make the farmer prosperous; I do not care what you dissect or evolve out of it. The chemists can not do it.

This country is down economically. We must either cut our Budget over \$1,000,000,000, and there is no way to reduce it that I see except to reduce these expenditures or attempt to increase taxes \$1,000,000,000 and I favor reducing expenditures, and here is one place where I think we can cut one hundred thousand off appropriations. This is a heavy appropriation, and the chairman of the committee himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, has this to say about it:

Mr. BUCHANAN. The appropriation for 1932 was \$501,075, the appropriation for 1933 being \$453,699, and the Budget estimate for 1934 being \$426,238, a decrease of \$27,461, which I presume is the legislative furlough.

Doctor KNIGHT. That represents the legislative furlough. There is no change otherwise.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You better give us a little account of this appropriation. It is a good-sized appropriation.

Doctor KNIGHT. I would be delighted to do so, but would first like to make a general statement regarding the work of the bureau as a whole with reference to the present needs of agriculture.

The farmer knows the needs of agriculture better than anyone living. He knows that the farmer needs and must have a better price for his products, and the chairman of this committee realizes this is a heavy appropriation, and instead of Doctor Knight going ahead and making out his case he said, "Oh, I want to make a general statement about it."

As I said in the beginning, the chairman reduced this appropriation, and I commend him for it. The appropriation now stands at \$410,000, and I am asking for a decrease of \$110,000, making it \$300,000. It is as hard to pay \$300,000 now with present farm prices as it was to pay \$1,000,000 in 1929. So this appropriation of \$410,000 to-day equals more than a million-dollar appropriation in 1929. It should be reduced.

I will say this, that we Democrats were elected to help do away with bureaucracy. This was the issue that was made in the campaign, and the people elected us on that issue. We might just as well start now. Of course, we can not wipe it all out, but you can start to cut down. The people back home are looking to the Democrats to cut down the expenditures at this session of Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought not to be voted up. The Bureau of Chemistry is one of the most valuable research bureaus in the Government, and especially in the Department of Agriculture. It has done more for the farmer and for industry than any scientific department of this Government.

It has saved millions of dollars to farmers in fertilizer alone. It has determined the proportion of fertilizer to use, the depth to put it, and a great many things of that kind. I have not the time and can not take time to go into the great accomplishments of this scientific bureau. I will ask you to read the report of the Secretary of Agriculture on this bureau and see how great the accomplishments have been. The committee cut this appropriation all it could stand, taking into consideration the depression now on.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Did you cut out any activities of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We cut out some projects, but did not cut out any bureaus or divisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLGOOD) there were 32 ayes and 42 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONTAGUE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13872) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the totals of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BUCHANAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. BYRNS, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 13975, Rept. 1814) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. SIMMONS reserved all points of order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HANCOCK] to ask for him indefinite leave of absence, on account of serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OCEAN MAIL-CARRYING SUBSIDIES

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the extent to which extravagance and prodigality have prevailed in the administration of the merchant marine act I call your attention to the following typical subsidies:

The Grace Steamship Line operates steamers over ocean mail route 38, between Tacoma and Valparaiso, Chile. In the fiscal year 1931 this company, under contract made by the Post Office Department, was paid \$238,500 for carrying 2,892 pounds of mail, which under the weight system and standard rates would have cost the Government only \$458.88.

The Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. (Inc.) operates steamers over ocean mail route 23, from Galveston to Santo Domingo, Haiti. In the fiscal year of 1931, under contract made by the Post Office Department, this company was paid \$317,916.50 for transporting 741 pounds of mail, which

under the weight system and standard rates would have cost the Government only \$194.64.

The Pacific Argentine Brazil Line (Inc.) operates steamers over ocean mail route 34, between San Francisco and Buenos Aires. In the fiscal year 1931, under a contract made by the Post Office Department, this company was paid \$286,398.42 for transporting 1,694 pounds of mail, which under the weight system and the standard rates prescribed by section 4009 would have cost the Government only \$141.28.

Ocean mail contract No. 5 is with the Export Steamship Corporation, which operates a line of steamers between New York and Mediterranean ports. Among its steamers are the *Examiner*, *Exermont*, *Exanthia*, and *Exchange*. On June 20, 1931, the *Examiner* sailed from New York for Tunis, Africa, a distance of 4,194 nautical miles, carrying only 851 pounds of mail, all parcel post. The cost to the Government under the standard rate prescribed by section 4009 would have been \$68.08, but under authority of the merchant marine act the Postmaster General had made a contract with this corporation, under which contract this shipping concern collected from the Government \$10,485, or one hundred and fifty-four times the standard rate. Compensation for this service was not based on the weight of the mail carried or the space in the vessel it occupied, but was arbitrarily fixed at \$2.50 for each of the 4,194 miles. Please bear in mind this 851 pounds of mail was not Government mail, but merchandise shipped by parcel post by private persons or business concerns.

On June 25, 1930, the *Exermont* sailed from New York to Beirut, Syria, a distance of 5,398 miles, carrying 934 pounds of parcel-post mail and 1 pound of letters. Under the weight system the cost of transporting this 935 pounds of mail would have been \$75.52, but under a contract made by the Postmaster General by authority of the merchant marine act the Government paid this ship for this trivial service \$13,495, which was at the rate of \$2.50 per mile for each of the 5,398 miles, or one hundred and seventy-nine times the standard rate.

On January 15, 1931, the *Exchange* sailed from New York to Naples, Italy, distant 4,436 miles, carrying 4,166 pounds of mail, all parcel post. Under the standard rates prescribed by section 4009 the cost of this service would have been \$333.28, but under a contract with the Postmaster General the shipowners collected \$11,090, or thirty-three times the standard rate, the settlement being on the basis of \$2.50 per mile for each of the 4,436 miles.

On June 15, 1931, the *Exanthia* sailed from New York to Constanza, a port in Rumania on the Black Sea, a distance of 5,237 miles. The vessel carried 3,936 pounds of mail, all parcel post. On a weight basis the cost of transporting this 3,936 pounds of parcel post would be \$314.88, but for this little batch of mail, weighing less than 66 bushels of wheat, Uncle Sam paid this shipping concern \$13,672.50, or forty-three times the standard rate.

The Mississippi Shipping Co. has a contract under the merchant marine act to operate boats over ocean mail route 35, between New Orleans and Bahia Blanca, Argentina, a distance of 6,233 miles. In 1930 and 1931, the vessels of this company carried in the aggregate only 161 pounds of mail. On a weight basis and at rates prescribed by section 4009, this service would have cost the Government only \$95.68, but under its contract, the shipping company collected \$607,792.50 for this service, or six thousand three hundred and fifty-two times the standard rate. For carrying each pound of this mail the Government paid \$3,775.11.

Under the merchant marine act, the Postmaster General made a contract with the Eastern Steamship Lines (Inc.) to cover ocean mail route 15 from Boston to Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, a distance of 237 miles. The contract rate was \$8 per mile without reference to the amount of mail carried. In June 30, 1929, one of its vessels, the *Yarmouth*, sailed with only 296 pounds of mail, for the transportation of which this subsidized shipping concern received \$1,896—

two thousand four hundred and sixty-two times as much as the Burlington Railroad would charge for carrying a 296-pound hog from my home town, Carrollton, Mo., to National Stockyards in East St. Louis, a distance of 274 miles, or 37 miles farther than the distance from Boston to Yarmouth.

Under a contract with the Post Office Department the American West African Line operates over ocean mail route 47, between New Orleans and the West Coast of Africa. It made five voyages in the fiscal year of 1931, carrying only 133 pounds of mail. On a weight basis this service would have cost the Government only \$42.32, but this subsidized shipping concern was paid \$87,862.50 for transporting an armful of mail that weighed less than 2½ bushels of wheat.

The United States Lines has a contract with the Post Office Department for carrying mails over ocean mail route 44, between New York and London, a distance of 3,369 miles. Under this contract, and without regard to the amount of mail carried, this company is paid \$20,214 for each voyage, or at the rate of \$6 per mile for each outbound trip. On June 12, 1931, one of its steamers, *American Merchant*, sailed from New York with only 2 pounds of letters. Under the weight basis that prevailed before the enactment of the merchant marine act the cost of carrying 2 pounds of mail would have been only \$1.60, but for transporting less than a handful of letters this subsidized shipping corporation was paid \$20,214, or twelve thousand six hundred and thirty-three times the standard rates.

Tampa Intercocean Steamship Co. has a contract with the Post Office Department covering ocean mail route 45, from New Orleans to Spain. In 1931 its boats made 34 trips, carrying in the aggregate 85 pounds of mail and averaging 2½ pounds of mail per trip. The cost to the Government for this service under the standard rate prescribed by section 4009 would have been \$58.64. But this shipping concern collected \$438,716.36 for carrying this 85 pounds of mail, which was at the rate of \$5.161 per pound, or seven thousand four hundred and eighty-one times what would have been paid for this service if the 85 pounds of mail had been carried by a ship not subsidized by the United States Government. Eighty-five dollars, or \$1 per pound, would have been a large compensation for carrying 85 pounds of merchandise or other freight, but for carrying 85 pounds of mail the company was paid the amazing and unconscionable price of \$5.162 per pound, and the American taxpayers bear the load.

The Oceanic & Oriental Navigation Co. has contracts with the Post Office Department for carrying mails over routes 30, 31, 48, and 49, between Los Angeles and Auckland, New Zealand; between Los Angeles and Melbourne, Australia; between San Francisco and Dairen (Dalny or Talien), China; between San Francisco and Saigon, Cochinchina. This company, operating under the merchant marine act, has contracts with the Post Office Department covering a 10-year period and calling for the payment of \$10,582,132. In the fiscal year 1931 the Government paid this subsidized shipping concern \$881,373.45 for carrying 164,409 pounds of mail, which was at the average rate of \$5.36 per pound. This subsidized steamship company received approximately \$900,000 for carrying mails weighing less than six hundred and fifty-eight 250-pound hogs.

On November 8, 1930, the *Golden Mountain*, owned and operated by the Oceanic & Oriental Navigation Co., sailed, carrying only 65 pounds of mail, all parcel post. Under the weight system the transportation of this mail would have cost the Government only \$5.20, but under a contract with the Post Office Department the shipping company, for carrying this 65 pounds of mail, was paid \$17,400, or three thousand three hundred and forty-six times what it would have cost the Government if the 65 pounds of mail had been carried by a vessel not operating under the merchant marine act.

Tacoma Oriental Steamship Co. operates a line of steamers over ocean mail route 36, between Tacoma and Dairen,

China, a distance of 6,629 miles. In the two years prior to July 19, 1931, on 46 voyages this company carried 157 pounds of letters, 436 pounds of newspapers, 19,982 pounds of parcel post, and 7,141 pounds of foreign closed mail, a total of 27,716 pounds, or an average of 620 pounds on each voyage. On a weight basis, and at the standard rate prescribed by section 4009, the transportation of this mail would have cost the Government only \$2,009.06, and the cost would have been no more had it been carried by vessels not subsidized under the merchant marine act.

But the Post Office Department, under the provisions of the merchant marine act, had made a contract under which this shipping company for this service collected from the Government \$666,384.75, or three hundred and thirty-one times the cost at standard rates. The charge of \$24 per pound for carrying this mail was grossly excessive and out of proportion with the charges per pound for carrying other articles making up the ship's cargo. An examination of the records will show that the charge on no other part of the cargo was in excess of \$1 per pound, but under the maladministration of the merchant marine act the Government was mulcted to the extent of \$24 per pound for transporting these mails.

At this point may I call your attention to a typical transaction that not only points a moral and adorns a tale but shows the amazing prodigality and wastefulness of public funds that has characterized the administration of the merchant marine act. I refer to the *Shelton*, one of the boats owned and operated by the Tacoma Oriental Steamship Co. When this vessel sailed on June 19, 1931, it carried only 1 pound of letter mail, yet under a contract made by the Post Office Department this shipping concern collected from the United States Government \$14,915.25 for carrying this 1 pound of letter mail on this voyage. At standard rates the transportation of this 1-pound letter mail would have been 80 cents, but under the improvident contract made by the Post Office Department this subsidized shipping concern collected \$14,915.25 for carrying this 1 pound of letter mail, or over eighteen thousand times as much as the cost would have been had the 1 pound of mail been carried by a boat not subsidized under the maladministered provisions of the merchant marine act. As long as transactions of this character are tolerated, is it strange that we have an unbalanced National Budget?

The South Atlantic Steamship Co. of Delaware has a contract for carrying mail on ocean mail route 33, between Savannah, Ga., and Liverpool, England, 3,630 miles, and between Savannah and Bremen, Germany, 4,149 miles. This company has a fleet of 10 or 12 freighters, which, under the contract, make in the aggregate 26 voyages annually. The Government pays this subsidized shipping concern \$2.50 per mile for each outbound trip, without regard to the quantity of mail carried. A trip from Savannah to Liverpool costs Uncle Sam \$9,075, and a trip from Savannah to Bremen costs \$10,372.50, although only a few pounds of mail are carried. In two and one-half years prior to June 30, 1931, the vessels of this company made 93 trips. The mail carried on these 93 trips weighed 1,200 pounds.

The transportation of these 1,200 pounds of mail cost the Government \$913,170, or at the rate of \$760 per pound. If these 1,200 pounds of mail had been carried by a vessel not subsidized under the merchant marine act, the cost would have been \$178.24. On an average, only 13 pounds of mail were carried on each of the 93 trips, and the average pay for each voyage was \$9,819, or \$755 for every pound of mail. The record of these 93 sailings shows that on many of the trips only 1 pound of letter mail and 1 pound of newspaper mail were carried.

For ships not operating under the merchant marine act the standard rate for carrying 1 pound of letters is 80 cents, and for carrying 1 pound of newspaper mail the standard rate is 8 cents, a total of 88 cents for carrying 2 pounds of mail, all that was carried on many voyages, but for carrying 2 pounds of mail from Savannah to Liverpool this shipping

company, by the grace of the merchant marine act, was paid \$9,075, or ten thousand three hundred and twelve times the standard rate. And for carrying 2 pounds of mail from Savannah to Bremen this company was paid \$10,372.50, or eleven thousand seven hundred and eighty-six times the standard rate.

Among the vessels operated by this company are the *Saccarappa*, *Chickshinny*, *Magmeria*, *Coldwater*, *Tulsa*, and *Fluor Spar*. In April, 1931, the *Coldwater* and *Fluor Spar* sailed from Savannah to Bremen, and the *Tulsa* sailed from Savannah to Liverpool. Each vessel carried only 1 pound of letter mail and 1 pound of newspapers. For these voyages, under a contract made by the Post Office Department, the vessels were paid as follows: *Coldwater*, \$10,372.50; *Fluor Spar*, \$10,372.50; *Tulsa*, \$9,075. Reduced to a pound basis, the two ships, each carrying two pounds of mail to Bremen, charged for that service at the rate of \$5,186.25 per pound, and the ship destined for Liverpool, carrying two pounds of mail, charged for that service at the rate of \$4,537.50 per pound.

In May, 1932, the *Saccarappa* and *Magmeria* sailed from Savannah to Bremen, and the *Chickshinny* sailed from Savannah to Liverpool. Each of these ships carried only 1 pound of letter mail and 1 pound of newspapers. For these voyages, under contracts made by the Post Office Department, the *Saccarappa* and *Magmeria* were each paid \$10,372.50, and the *Chickshinny* was paid \$9,075, or at the rate of \$4,537.50 per pound. For transporting only 12 pounds of mail, this shipping concern was paid \$59,620, or an average of nearly \$5,000 per pound.

And, moreover, the postage on the 12 pounds of mail carried on these six voyages was only \$5.28. That is to say, the Government received \$5.28 postage and paid out \$59,620 for carrying the 12 pounds of mail, a net loss to the Government of \$59,614.72. Here we have the concrete and convincing illustration of the high cost of mail transportation by ships that are subsidized under the merchant marine act. The contract with the Post Office Department under which this company operates requires the Government to pay the steamship company \$2.50 per mile for every mile sailed on each outbound voyage, whether the ship carries 1 pound or 100,000 pounds of mail.

In the fiscal year 1931 this company was paid \$363,022.50 for transporting 74 pounds of mail, which, under the weight system and standard rates, would have cost only \$32.56. In other words, the cost was eleven thousand one hundred and forty-nine times as much as it would have been had this mail been carried in ships that did not have contracts with the Post Office Department.

Why should the taxpayers of the United States pay this shipping company nearly a million dollars for carrying 1,200 pounds of mail from Savannah, Ga., to Liverpool or Bremen when this small quantity of mail could have been sent from Savannah to New York by train, and by ships from New York to Liverpool or Bremen at the cost of only a few dollars, and the delivery by this last-mentioned route would have been more expeditious.

I have been requested to name the shipping concerns owned and operated by Mr. Kermit Roosevelt and his associates. I am not sure that I can enumerate all of these companies, but I will give you the benefit of all the information I have on that subject.

The International Mercantile Marine Co. is a New Jersey corporation. Its New York office is at 1 Broadway. It is both a holding and operating company. P. A. S. Franklin is president and Kermit Roosevelt is one of the five vice presidents. This company, on May 17, 1932, owned the following subsidiary companies:

Roosevelt Steamship Co. (Inc.).

Société Anonyme de Navigation Belge-Américaine (a Belgian corporation).

Atlantic Transport Co.

American Line Steamship Corporation.

Atlantic Transport Co. (Ltd.) (a British corporation).
No. 1 Broadway Corporation.

International Mercantile Marine Dock Co. (Inc.).

Jointly with the Dollar-Dawson interests of San Francisco, the International Mercantile Marine Co., through its ownership of the Roosevelt Steamship Co., owns the United States Lines Co.

The International Mercantile Marine Co. acquired the entire capital stock of the Roosevelt Steamship Co. (Inc.) in January, 1931.

The International Mercantile Marine Co. operates the following steamship lines: Red Star, Atlantic Transport, Panama Pacific, and Leyland.

The American Line Steamship Corporation, a subsidiary of the International Mercantile Marine Co., has ocean mail contract 32, which, in the 10-year period, calls for approximate payments of \$4,132,648. In the fiscal year 1931 this company was paid \$418,496 for carrying mail, which at standard rates under section 4009, would have cost the Government only \$28,202.51, a subsidy of \$390,293.49.

The Roosevelt Steamship Co. (Inc.) has a contract over route 46 between Baltimore and Hamburg calling for an approximate payment during the 10-year term of \$12,475,620. The Baltimore Mail Steamship Co. is rendering this service as a subcontractor of the Roosevelt Steamship Co. The Roosevelt Steamship Co. is managing agent of the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., which is a subsidiary of the International Mercantile Marine Co. The officers of the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., including Kermit Roosevelt, are officers of the International Mercantile Marine Co. and the Roosevelt Steamship Co. (Inc.).

The United States Lines Co., a subsidiary of the International Mercantile Marine Co., operates over ocean route 43 under contract which, during the 10-year period, calls for the payment of approximately \$17,344,366. It also operates over route 44 under a contract which, in the 10-year period, calls for the payment of \$10,862,260. In the fiscal year of 1931 this company, under contract 43, was paid \$490,248 for carrying mail which under the weight system prescribed by section 4009 would have cost the Government only \$311,398.87, an out-and-out subsidy of \$178,849.13.

Under contract 44 this company received \$1,052,454 for service which under the weight system prescribed by section 4009 would have cost only \$231,169.06, which means a subsidy of \$821,284.94.

The subsidies obtained in the fiscal year 1931 by these Roosevelt associated lines were as follows:

Contract 32, American Line Steamship Corporation.....	\$390,293.49
Contract 43, United States Lines (Inc.).....	178,849.13
Contract 44, United States Lines.....	821,284.94
Total	1,390,427.56

Service on route 46 (Roosevelt Steamship Co., contractor, Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., subcontractor) began July 1, 1931. For the fiscal year 1931 this company carried 297,622 pounds of mail, which under the weight system or standard rates prescribed by section 4009, would have cost the Government \$34,236.86, but the Government actually paid this company for this service \$1,027,404. Of the \$1,027,404 paid the Roosevelt Steamship Co. for this service on this one contract for the fiscal year 1932, \$993,167.14, or practically \$1,000,000, was a subsidy or gift.

For the fiscal year 1932 the American Line Steamship Co. (a Roosevelt-International Mercantile Merchant Marine concern), under contract 32, carried 471,644 pounds of mail, which on a poundage basis would have cost the Government \$45,355.68, but for which service the company received from the Government \$414,472, or a subsidy of \$369,116.32.

The United States Lines Co. (a Roosevelt-International Mercantile Merchant Marine concern), under contract 43, carried 9,505,904 pounds of mail, which on a weight basis would have cost the Government \$1,164,291.75, but for which service this company was paid \$1,391,106, \$226,815.20 of which was a subsidy or bounty.

For the fiscal year 1932 the last above-mentioned company, under contract 44, carried 2,284,141 pounds of mail, the cost of which service under standard rates would have been \$304,143.71, but for which service the company was paid \$1,052,922, \$748,778.29 of which was a bonus, subsidy, or gratuity paid over and above the standard rate.

The subsidies obtained in the fiscal year 1931 by these four so-called Roosevelt lines were as follows:

Contract 32, American Line Steamship Corporation.....	\$369,116.32
Contract 43, United States Lines Co.....	226,815.25
Contract 44, United States Lines Co.....	748,778.29
Contract 46, Roosevelt Steamship Co.....	993,167.14

Subsidies on contracts 32, 43, and 44 for fiscal year 1931, as hereinbefore shown.....	2,337,877.00
	1,390,427.56

Total subsidies paid these 4 Roosevelt companies for fiscal years 1931 and 1932..... 3,728,304.56

The foregoing statistics as to payments made under contracts 32, 43, 44, and 46 were furnished by the Post Office Department in response to a request from me for such information.

It may be that the International Mercantile Marine Co. controls other shipping lines that are being enriched by subsidies paid out of the United States Treasury, but as to this I will express no opinion until I can find time to investigate further and ascertain what, if any, other subsidized shipping concerns are affiliated with or controlled by this Roosevelt holding company.

I have made an honest effort to enumerate some of the most prodigal, wasteful, and grossly excessive subsidies that have been and are being paid shipping concerns under the merchant marine act, in the hope that the conscience of the American people may be awakened to a realization of the unconscionable maladministration of this act and take steps to halt the reckless grant of public funds to shipping concerns that give no adequate return therefor. The administration of the merchant marine act by the Post Office Department furnishes a graphic illustration of the evils of an unrestrained bureaucracy. The fatal weakness of a bureaucratic system of government is that it inevitably becomes either corrupt or prodigal in the expenditure of public funds.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what the program is going to be on Tuesday next and, if the Speaker is able to give it to me, I would like to know what it is to be for the remainder of the week?

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not tell the gentleman definitely. The deficiency appropriation bill has been reported, and the Chair understands from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that there will be other appropriation bills ready to follow the deficiency bill, which the Chair presumes will be taken up on Tuesday. It is to be hoped that the Agricultural Committee will report its bill, known as the agricultural relief bill. If it does, the Chair thinks it is the purpose of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], and others, to ask the Committee on Rules for a rule, and to take that up at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SNELL. But the deficiency appropriation bill will come up on Tuesday?

Mr. BYRNS. That is the expectation; yes.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair understands from the gentleman from Tennessee that there will be other appropriation bills ready to follow that.

Mr. BYRNS. It is my earnest hope and expectation that there will be another appropriation bill ready to follow as soon as this bill has been disposed of. It has not been quite marked up as yet, but I understand that it will be ready.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly

enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7233. An act to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 527. Joint resolution extending the time for filing the report of the Joint Committee to Investigate the Operation of the Laws and Regulations relating to the Relief of Veterans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 3, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BYRNS: Committee on Appropriations. House bill 13975. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 13972) to repeal the tax on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 13973) to amend the act of May 29, 1930, relating to the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 13974) granting the consent of Congress to Bonner County, State of Idaho, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pend Oreille Lake at the city of Sandpoint in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 13975) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 13976) for the relief of the Rocky Brook Mills Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 13977) granting a pension to Russell G. Cromwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 13978) granting a pension to Wade Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 13979) for the relief of Anner Chase Roundy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13980) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Gilford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13981) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Conkel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13982) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Kees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 13983) granting a pension to Lee Newton Hutchinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 13984) granting an increase of pension to Melvin E. Goodding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 13985) for the relief of John E. T. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13986) for the relief of Harvey Stump; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 13987) for the relief of Jack H. Straight; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 13988) granting a pension to Allen G. T. Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON: A bill (H. R. 13989) granting a pension to Lizzie Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13990) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Melton; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9306. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of citizens of Kalkaska, Mich., favoring the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9307. Also, petition of citizens of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and vicinity, favoring the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9308. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Warehousemen's Association of the Port of New York, protesting against favorable consideration by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the appeal proposed to be made to it for a loan of \$11,000,000, or any other sum, for financing the proposed or any other development of the waterfront in the harbor of New York for terminal facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

9309. By Mr. DeROUEN: Petition of H. G. Patterson and other residents of Jeff Davis Parish, La., urging that the United States Government seed loan be continued for 1933 crop production and made available as soon as possible; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9310. Also, petition of H. G. Patterson, W. F. Tietje, J. F. Hoke, B. L. Orvis, and other citizens of the parish of Jeff Davis, La., praying that rice be included in the domestic allotment plan bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9311. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, urging the passage of the duck stamp bills, S. 4726 and H. R. 12246, providing money for the protection of water fowl in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9312. Also, petition of the Jamie Kelly Association (Inc.), of Brooklyn, N. Y., unanimously adopting a protest against any further reduction in Federal salaries, especially the salaries of the postal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9313. By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Petition of Mrs. John Dowling, of Far Hills, N. J., and 10 other citizens of Bedminster and Far Hills, urging passage of stop-alien representation to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9314. Also, resolution adopted by the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Hopewell, Dunellen, Chatham Boro, and Princeton, N. J., requesting Congress to enact a law for

Government regulation and supervision of motion-picture industry and urging passage of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9315. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of R. W. Mottern and 17 others favoring the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on Labor.

9316. By Mr. GARBER: Petition urging enactment of the railroad pension bills, S. 4646 and H. R. 9891; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9317. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of W. R. Ely, chairman Texas State Highway Commission, Austin, Tex., urging that Federal aid for roads be not reduced; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9318. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Punxsutawney, Pa., favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens and count only American citizens when making future congressional apportionments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9319. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Durango, Colo., urging the passage of the Capper-Sparks bill to prohibit the counting of aliens in making future apportionments for congressional districts of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

9320. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Tony Bosseau and other residents of Avella, Washington County, Pa., requesting support of the Davis-Kelly coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.